DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 201 206 FL 012 287

AUTHOR Bisagna, Joanne
TITLE Sociolinguistic and Pedagogical Considerations in Teaching Standard English to Speakers of Puerto Rican English in New York City.
PUB DATE [80]
NOTE 102p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; English (Second Language); *English Instruction; Hispanic Americans; Language Attitudes; Language Research; Learning Problems; *Nonstandard Dialects; *Puerto Ricans; Sociolinguistics; Standard Spoken Usage; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Effectiveness
IDENTIFIERS *English (Puerto Rican); *English as a Second Dialect

ABSTRACT

Many Puerto Rican children currently enrolled in English as a second language (ESL) classes speak Puerto Rican English (PRE). Their speech is characterized by nonstandard features, including some from Black English. Because of actual or historical interference from Spanish, they do qualify for ESL enrollment, yet their language problems are different from those of second language learners. They are fluent in PRE but need practice in oral control of Standard English (SE). They usually lack integrative motivation for acquiring SE. The small body of literature of PRE is reviewed in this paper. Differences between second dialect and second language teaching and learning are discussed. Societal barriers to SE acquisition and conditions which create and perpetuate interlanguages are argued to be factors in the maintenance of PRE. Classroom teachers' negative evaluation and ignorance of students' nonstandard speech contribute to ineffective teaching. Responses to a questionnaire support the hypothesis that licensed ESL teachers are less likely than classroom teachers to make negative judgments and more capable of accurate linguistic description. Their descriptions, which are itemized, provide evidence of the systematic nature of PRE. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED201206

SOCIOLINGUISTIC AND PEDAGOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS IN TEACHING STANDARD ENGLISH TO SPEAKERS OF PUERTO RICAN ENGLISH IN NEW YORK CITY

BY

JOANNE BISAGNA

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Bisagna

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FL 012 287

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS vi

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. ISSUES IN THE TEACHING OF STANDARD ENGLISH . . . 5

The Concept of Language Dominance 5
The Idiolect 7
The Spanish-Dominant Student of ESL 9
The Puerto Rican English Speaker in ESL 11
Language Contact 14
Studies of Puerto Rican English 16
Non-Standard Black English Dialect 21
Puerto Rican English 24
Facts and Myths about Non-Standard Dialects 27
The idea of "verbal deprivation" 27
Effect of Teachers' Ignorance of Students' Dialect 28
Effect of Teachers' Ignorance of General Linguistic Principles 31
The Need for Useful Linguistic Data 34
Expectations for Students Learning Standard English 37
Teachers' Attitudes 37
Super-Standard 40
Realistic Standard 40
Style 42
Linguistic Appropriateness 44
Teaching Standard English 46
Barriers to Acquisition of Standard English 54
Societal Factors 54
Individual Motivation 59

III. REPORT OF A STUDY OF PUERTO RICAN ENGLISH SPEAKERS AND THEIR ESL TEACHERS 64

Purpose 64
Procedures 65
Responses 69
Differences between PRE Speakers and "F" Students 69
Differences between PRE Speakers in ESL and English-speaking Peers 70
Description of Students' Language 71
Description of Major Language Problems 78
Description of Problems in Teaching 81
Summary 82

IV. CONCLUSION 84

APPENDIX 1 88
Questionnaire to Teachers of ESL

APPENDIX 2 90
Personal Data Sheet

APPENDIX 3 91
Oral Language Ability Rating Scale

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY 92

LIST OF TABLES

1. Enrollment Percentages of Black and Puerto Rican Students in New York City Schools as of Spring 1976 15
2. Enrollment Percentages of PRE Speakers in Nine Schools 66
3. Personal and Professional Data on Respondents . . . 68

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To the Puerto Rican students in ESL classes throughout New York City who opened my eyes to the need for a fuller understanding of their abilities and their needs, I wish to express my thanks. It was they who interested me in this undertaking which was sustained by my hope of contributing in some way to a more reasonable, more sensitive and more effective approach to their education.

For confidentiality and privacy, the teachers who participated in this study cannot be named. To all of them, for responding with such unexpected cheerfulness and thoroughness to my questionnaire, I am deeply grateful. Their thoughtful and detailed comments provided me with invaluable insights and much useful information.

I would like to extend my sincerest thanks and appreciation to my family and friends who supported me in this work, and especially to Hector Villafane for his patience, understanding and encouragement, his well-informed criticisms of the manuscript and his unfailing and inspiring confidence in my completion of this project.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1. These excerpts of classroom dialogue were recorded in a beginning level English as a Second Language class:

Teacher: "Where is the star - on the top or on the bottom?"
Student: "In the top."

Teacher: "Please copy these words."
Student: "I no have pencil."

2. These excerpts were recorded in an advanced level English as a Second Language class:

Teacher: "Do you have an umbrella today?"
Student: "No, but Carmen do."
Teacher: "Carmen what?"
Student: "Carmen doos."

Teacher: "I think this is your paper, Rosa."
Student: "I didn't did this one."

Teacher: "Well, what about the stars [for good behavior] today? Did you behave well?"
Student: "No, we be bad; we didn't listen."

These samples of conversation were recorded from written notes made during observations of English as a Second Language (ESL) classes. The students are all Puerto Rican children and range from first through eighth grade. Their responses show certain deviations from Standard English usage. Those listed under number 1 above are probably due to Spanish language interference since they were made by children who have had little exposure to English and are clearly Spanish-dominant.

Both of these students have recently arrived from Puerto Rico. The responses listed under number 2 above were given by students of Puerto Rican background who have had many years of exposure to English and who speak English rather fluently, although with marked deviations from Standard English such as the ones shown.

In this paper, it will be proposed that utterances of the type listed under number 2 are representative of the speech of many Puerto Rican children in ESL classes and that the "errors" they contain are partially due to the interference of non-standard Black English and partially to the unique nature of Puerto Rican English (PRE) as well as to Spanish interference.

On the basis of four years of regular supervisory visits to ESL classes in New York City elementary schools, this writer has become increasingly aware of a large number of Puerto Rican ESL students who produce utterances like the ones under number 2. With this awareness has come the recognition of the pressing need for a proper identification of this group of students and of their English speech.

The students in question are of Puerto Rican background and are what might be considered "advanced" ESL pupils: they are verbally fluent in English, are English-dominant or even mono-lingual in English and may or may not be bilingual in Spanish. Many of them were born in New York City and have lived here all their lives. They use English in almost all interactions, except for some family interactions in the home. Some have only a passive understanding of Spanish; their productive skills in Spanish may be poor. Yet there is general agreement among their classroom teachers, ESL teachers and school principals

that these children need some sort of additional instruction in English. Their educational achievement is usually far below the expected norms for their age and grade level. Their greatest problem area is usually reading. Their speech is characterized by many non-standard features.

It has been suggested that these students speak a non-standard variety of English known as Puerto Rican English.[1] The phonological, morphological and syntactical rules of this dialect reflect the influences of Black English as well as of Spanish. However, some characteristics of PRE are not traceable to either of those sources, but are unique in many respects. The features of this dialect have yet to be fully classified in the same way that Black English (BE) dialect features have been.

In this paper, the need for an adequate linguistic description of this language or interlanguage[2] will be stressed. Samples of student speech will be listed in Chapter III and compared with known features of BE and PRE. Evidence of the systematic nature of this language variety will be given.

In addition, it will be the purpose of this paper to

---

[1]Walt Wolfram, Sociolinguistic Aspects of Assimilation: Puerto Rican English in New York City, Urban Language Series, no. 9 (Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1974), p. 1; Roxana Ma and Eleanor Herasimchuk, "The Linguistic Dimensions of a Bilingual Neighborhood," in Joshua A. Fishman, Robert L. Cooper, Roxana Ma et al., Bilingualism inthe Barrio, Language Science Monographs, no. 7 (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University, 1975), p. 366.

[2]For a definition and discussion of this term see p. 57 below.

discuss the major issue in the language education of these PRE speakers, namely teaching them Standard English so that they may function effectively in the school system. The ways in which they differ from Spanish-dominant children learning English will be examined. The problems that these students pose for teachers using "traditional" ESL techniques will be detailed and the value of second-dialect teaching methods appraised. These linguistic and pedagogical issues are no less important than the social and psychological issues, however. The effects of attitudes and expectations of both teachers and students on learning will be explored. The sociological implications of teaching a standard dialect to members of a racial minority group will also be discussed.

In Chapter Three the results of a questionnaire given to ESL teachers of Puerto Rican students will be analyzed. The information obtained from this questionnaire is of two types: direct reporting of student speech and statements of problems in teaching and indirect revelations of teachers' attitudes towards their students' non-standard speech. Both will be analyzed.

CHAPTER II

ISSUES IN THE TEACHING OF STANDARD ENGLISH

The Concept of Language Dominance

Before entering into a discussion of the Spanish-dominant and English-dominant ESL students referred to in the Introduction, it should be made clear that the terms "Spanish-dominant" and "English-dominant" are used with the understanding that the question of language dominance is complex.

> To ask the question 'Which language is dominant?' is to look for mere dichotomy where a much more complex situation exists. We have to modify the question to ' . . . dominant with respect to whom and when?'"[1]

Similarly, Mackey has suggested that the appropriate question to be asked in determining bilingualism is not, "Is a person bilingual?" but rather, "How bilingual is he?'"[2]

The child's degree of bilingualism may be located on a continuum ranging from monolingual in Spanish (with no proficiency at all in English in any context) to native-like control

---

[1]Ma and Herasimchuk, "Bilingual Neighborhood," p. 354.

[2]William F. Mackey, "Toward a Redefinition of Bilingualism," Journal of the Canadian Linguistic Association (March, 1956), quoted in Theodore Andersson and Mildred Boyer, Bilingual Schooling in the United States (Austin, Texas: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, 1970), p. 10.

of both English and Spanish in several contexts. Between these two extremes, we must face the challenge of identifying competencies of students in both languages.

> Macnamara has described several dimensions along which bilingual performance can vary: degree of bilingualism, coordinateness or compoundness of semantic systems, linguistic independence, linguistic interference, switching, and translation.[1]

A discussion of the interference and code-switching phenomena in bilinguals is beyond the purview of this paper, but it is essential to note here that, in themselves, interference and switching behaviors are merely indicators of bilingualism, not of dominance in a particular language.

In other words, linguistic structures of both types 1 and 2 on page 1 above may appear in the speech of any one individual. Spanish may intrude in the speech of a child speaking English and English in that of a child speaking Spanish. It is much too simplistic to expect to label that child accurately as Spanish-dominant or English-dominant on the basis of that item of interference alone. Students will fall into one or the other category (Spanish- or English-dominant) depending on the type of interference that most frequently occurs and on the circumstances, the setting, and with whom he is speaking.

---

[1]Robert L. Cooper, "Psychologically Oriented Studies," in Fishman et al., Bilingualism in the Barrio, p. 274.

The Idiolect

The range of possible linguistic abilities in both languages necessitates a thorough and careful assessment of the child's bilingualism to ensure proper placement in an instructional program. Appropriate selection of materials and methods for teaching the child also requires as much information as possible about his idiolect (his particular speech system).

In the same way that Mackey outlined a typology of bilingual programs,[1] a taxonomy of bilingual students must also be developed. Chiu believes that the formulation of a learner typology is necessary to account for the sociolinguistic requirements of different kinds of language learners.[2]

Some of the sociolinguistic variables that will affect the learner's idiolect are: language or languages spoken by the parents, age, socio-economic status, opportunities for contacts with speakers of the target language, and the quality of these contacts (whether as equals or as members of a minority group that suffers discrimination), need or desire to learn the target language, basic intelligence, and self-image.

Professor Willis of Long Island University listed four

---

[1]William F. Mackey, "A Typology of Bilingual Education," in Teaching English as a Second Language, 2d ed., edited by Harold B. Allen and Russell N. Campbell (New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1972), pp. 414-433.

[2]Rosaline K. Chiu, "Measuring Register Characteristics: A Prerequisite for Advanced Level TESOL Programs," TESOL Quarterly 6 (June, 1972): 135.

types of students with respect to only one of these variables, the language spoken by the parents:

> 1. Both parents are monolingual in the foreign language
> 2. One parent speaks English as a native; the other is a native speaker of the foreign language
> 3. Both parents speak English to the child but are native speakers of the foreign language
> 4. Both parents switch back and forth[1]
>
> Variables such as family origin, recency of migration, degree of isolation from influences outside the subculture, attitudes toward self, personal and parental goals are some of the factors which may determine idiolect.[2]

There are probably many other possible variations in a student's background that may affect his learning English.

Assessment of a bilingual student should provide information about his proficiency in both languages.

There are direct tests of language proficiency such as listening comprehension or reading comprehension tests. There are also more indirect measures of degree of bilingualism. An example of the latter would be the Spanish Usage Rating Scale used by Cooper and Greenfield to assess relative proportions of Spanish and English usage in five societal domains.[3] Other indirect measures are ". . . tests of verbal fluency, tests of flexibility and tests of dominance."[4]

---

[1]Robert M. Willis, "Training Bilingual Teachers," paper presented at the 23rd Annual Conference of the International Linguistic Association, New York, 10 March 1978.

[2]Kenneth S. Goodman, "Dialect Barriers to Reading Comprehension," in Teaching Black Children to Read, ed. Joan C. Baratz and Roger W. Shuy, Urban Language Series, no. 4 (Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969), p. 17.

[3]Cooper, "Psychologically Oriented Studies," p. 275.

[4]Ibid., p. 274.

The Spanish-Dominant Student of ESL

1. "Where is the star - on the top or on the bottom?"
   "In the top."

   "Please copy these words."
   "I no have pencil."

These samples of student speech are characteristic of Spanish-dominant students of English. The "errors" of these students are most frequently due to interference from Spanish syntax, morphology, lexicon, or phonology. For example, because the Spanish word _en_ encompasses the meanings of both _in_ and _on_ in English, and because _en_ sounds more like English _in_, students tend to use _in_ for all situations where _en_ is used in Spanish. This results in sentences like _I write in the blackboard_ or _I have my shoes in my feet_.

Clearly, students who make such errors are candidates for ESL and/or bilingual classes for the Spanish-dominant.

Pupils who have recently arrived from Puerto Rico, or those who are just entering school from a home where only Spanish is spoken and who have never spoken English before, are probably in this category. They are readily recognized by their teachers as requiring formal instruction in English as a Second Language.

The specially trained teacher of ESL is well-equipped to work with such children using accepted methods of second-language instruction. Systematic practice is given in mastering the syntactic structures of English, vocabulary is developed, and recognition and production of English sounds are taught.

Materials have been developed for Spanish ESL students.

A teacher who knows Spanish, or even one who does not but who has taken a course in Methods of Contrastive Analysis, will have no difficulty accepting that errors such as I no have pencil can and do occur with frequency and regularity in the process of learning English. The teacher accepts this as an example of transfer[1] of the grammatical structure of the native language onto the target language (Yo no tengo lápiz in Spanish has no article.) The important factor here is that there is no value judgment on the part of the teacher regarding such errors. According to William Stewart, this is due to a shared respect for the foreign language on the part of teachers and learners.

> In a foreign language relationship both the teacher and the learners are generally aware of the existence of traditional grammars, dictionaries, and other accepted codifications of the structure of each language. Thus they are disposed to regard both as constituting legitimate and autonomous linguistic systems, each with its own independent structure and "logic."[2]

This attitude contrasts strongly with the reaction to non-standard dialects which are often viewed as deviant and inferior and are judged by the teachers as wrong or incorrect versions of another language.

---

[1]Robert Lado, Linguistics Across Cultures (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1957), p. 58.

[2]William A. Stewart, "Urban Negro Speech: Sociolinguistic Factors Affecting English Teaching," in Social Dialects and Language Learning, ed. Roger W. Shuy (Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1964), p. 11.

2. "Do you have an umbrella today?"
"No, but Carmen do."
"Carmen what?"
"Carmen doos."

"I think this is your paper, Rosa."
"I didn't did this one."

"Well, what about the stars today? Did you behave well?
"No, we be bad; we didn't listen."

Some of the students who make errors like the ones above have been placed in ESL classes because they have been identified as having "limited English ability" or because they are exposed to another language in the home. Although their teachers say these students have to improve their English, it is probably more accurate to say that they have to improve their control of standard English since they do speak English quite fluently. It is, however, a non-standard, socially unaccepted variety of English.

Some of these students have been placed in bilingual classes for the Spanish-dominant because they score better (even if only slightly) in Spanish than they do in English on tests of language proficiency. They then receive part or all of their instruction in Spanish, even if their Spanish proficiency is low. Neither of these placements is exactly right, for these students' abilities do not fit neatly into the categories defined for students in either ESL or bilingual programs for the Spanish-dominant. Some PRE speakers continue in the mainstream, without any additional language instruction at all, where they lag behind their classmates in academic achievement, particularly in reading.

It is difficult to say which of these placements is the most inappropriate. It is not our purpose to explain or defend the placement of Puerto Rican English speakers in classes for ESL instruction but, given the fact of such placement, we must attempt to define what kind of English instruction these children really need.

Most Puerto Rican students who were born and raised in New York City in neighborhoods with large populations of Blacks are probably English-dominant. For many, if not most, English, not Spanish, is their stronger language. Some are mono-lingual in English. It was found that in the "barrio" of Jersey City, " . . . young people in speaking among themselves use English more often than Spanish in all domains including that of the family."[1]

This facility with English does not minimize the effect of Spanish, however, even on second and third generation speakers. Because of the actual or historical influence of Spanish, the language of these speakers cannot be equated with Black English, though it may have some similarities to it. No Black child in New York City would produce a sentence like I didn't did it. The rules of Black English past tense formation do not account for such an utterance; yet this is a very common pattern among users of PRE, as in We didn't went there or You didn't saw me?

Because neither the influence of Spanish nor of Black English is adequate to explain the features of PRE, it is

---

[1]Cooper, "Psychologically Oriented Studies," p. 282.

regarded as an autonomous language variety with elements of both Spanish and Black English as well as other features unique to itself. The features of Puerto Rican English " . . . are not dependent on [Spanish-English] bilingualism. . . they are an integral part of the dialect."[1]

Both the Spanish and the Black English influence are recognized in this definition by Bruce Fraser:

> The Puerto Rican who speaks Spanish natively and who learned English in Harlem speaks a dialect of English which exhibits features of extra-linguistic interference from his mother-tongue, Spanish, as well as the culturally determined extra-dialectal interference from the characteristics of Black English . . .[2]

It might be added that it is not only the Puerto Rican in Harlem who speaks that dialect, but also the Puerto Rican in Bedford-Stuyvesant, the South Bronx, or any other area of New York City where there is a high concentration of Black English speakers.

---

[1]Wolfram, Sociolinguistic Aspects of Assimilation, p. 3.

[2]Bruce Fraser, Non-Standard English (Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1970; Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 045 960, 1970), p. 5.

Language Contact

In 1953, Uriel Weinreich's Languages in Contact laid out the lines of research to be followed in determining the " . . . effect of languages other than English upon the linguistic behavior of particular ethnic groups."[1] Three tasks were delineated:

> . . . to provide formal descriptions of the particular dialect of the foreign language which is used, and of the English used by the second and third generation members of that ethnic group, and then to chart the possible relations between these.[2]

These tasks have been assumed by those studying the relationship between non-standard and standard dialects as well.

Wolfram is perhaps the best-known researcher today carrying out such studies among Puerto Rican English speakers. His work has concentrated on the language contact between Puerto Ricans and Black English speakers, especially in East Harlem " . . . where black and Puerto Rican school children may have considerable interaction."[3]

Recognition of the exposure to Black English which Puerto Rican children in New York City face is essential to an understanding of their language. "In some communities, the non-standard dialects represent the basic vernacular of over

---

[1]Uriel Weinreich, Languages in Contact (New York: Linguistic Circle of New York, 1953), quoted in William Labov, "Stages in the Acquisition of Standard English," in Social Dialects and Language Learning, p. 101.

[2]Labov, "Acquisition of Standard English," p. 101.

[3]Wolfram, Sociolinguistic Aspects of Assimilation, p. 2.

one half the students, and strongly influence the rest."[1]

> Although there are obviously many differences between the lower-class black and Puerto Rican cultures, there is an affinity which may unite the groups because of the ethnic and social discrimination found in American society (this is particularly true of darker-skinned Puerto Ricans . . .). Similar societal roles for Puerto Rican and black communities have been noted in a number of studies
> . . . . . .
> The similarity in social position, the physical proximity of the groups, and the inevitable social contact that must take place in neighborhood facilities (e.g. schools, . . .) provide an ideal situation for the study of language contact.[2] (Italics added.)

TABLE 1

ENROLLMENT PERCENTAGES OF BLACK AND PUERTO RICAN STUDENTS IN NYC SCHOOLS AS OF SPRING 1976

	Total NYC	District 4	District 7	District 9
% Black	37.9	38.2	33.3	50.3
% Puerto Rican	23.6	59.1	62.9	43.2
% Other Hispanics	5.4	1.7	3.2	4.5
% Other	33.1	.6	.7	1.2

SOURCE: New York City Board of Education, Office of Public Affairs, Ethnic Census, 1976.

Table 1, which gives enrollment percentages of Black and Puerto Rican children in three New York City school districts and in the city as a whole, illustrates the inevitability of

---

[1]Labov, The Study of Non-Standard English (Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1970), p. 62.

[2]Wolfram, "Objective and Subjective Parameters of Language Assimilation Among Second-Generation Puerto Ricans in East Harlem," in Language Attitudes: Current Trends and Prospects, ed. Roger W. Shuy and Ralph W. Fasold (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1973), p. 149.

social and hence linguistic contact between these two groups. In District 9, for example, Black students outnumber Puerto Ricans. In these three school districts, which have the highest number of Black and Puerto Rican school children in the City of New York, the percentage of "Other" ethnic groups, including Caucasians and Orientals, is no higher than 1.2%.

Studies of Puerto Rican English

Walt Wolfram studied twenty-nine second-generation Puerto Rican teenagers in East Harlem and divided them into two groups: those with restricted Black contacts and those with extensive Black contacts. He found that " . . . the influence of Black English phonological features is common to both groups . . . the differences between the groups being quantitative."[1]

It should be noted that his study concerned mostly phonological features because of their relatively greater susceptibility to borrowing than grammatical features.[2]

This focus on phonological features characterizes other studies of PRE, as well. In a measure of stylistic variation of speech (formal, careful, casual styles, etc.) Ma and Herasimchuk chose phonological variables as " . . . being among the most salient features"[3] in both Puerto Rican Spanish

---

[1]Ibid., p. 157.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Ma and Herasimchuk, "Bilingual Neighborhood," p. 366.

and Puerto Rican English, as well as having

> . . . the advantage of high frequency of occurrence in spoken text, easy codability, fair immunity to conscious suppression by the speaker and widespread distribution throughout the speech community.[1]

Of course, a full description of PRE will require not only phonological, but lexical and syntactical analysis as well. The problems of "codability" will pose a challenge to the linguist but must be overcome. The issue of "conscious suppression by the speaker" only arises in the context of a formal face-to-face interview or test situation and may be obviated by the gathering of data in an unguarded, natural language situation by a silent observer. Labov recommends classroom observation as a means of getting socio-linguistic data in his discussion of the limitations of the face-to-face interview.[2] In the Ma and Herasimchuk study all data was obtained through a formal questioning and interview procedure. In Chapter III, samples of student speech gathered from direct classroom observation will be given.

Ma and Herasimchuk mention only in an incidental way the apparent similarities between certain phonological variables in PRE and in the speech of Blacks, especially in vowels. They do recognize that the " . . . substandard, lower-class Negro speech of New York City"[3] is one of the most accessible speech styles to the Puerto Rican population ". . . since they live in

---

[1]Ibid.

[2]Labov, The Study of Non-Standard English, p. 68.

[3]Ma and Herasimchuk, "Bilingual Neighborhood," p. 436.

the same neighborhoods as do Negro speakers and have social and hence linguistic contacts with them."[1] However, a closer investigation of such language contact was outside the scope of their study of bilingualism and was not attempted.

For these reasons, Bilingualism in the Barrio does not answer several questions raised in the present study, for example, what are the grammatical features of PRE and how do they differ or relate to those of Black English?

More specifically, we must determine how these Puerto Rican children speak in the classroom. There is a disappointing lack of information in this area. In a twenty-nine page chapter entitled "Puerto Ricans in New York: A Language-Related Ethnographic Summary" the total amount of space devoted to a discussion of bilingualism in the domain of education is exactly ten sentences.[2]

Labov's great work The Study of the non-standard English of Negro and Puerto Rican speakers in New York City seems to contain the sort of information we wish to learn about Puerto Rican speakers of English. However, the title is deceptive. The authors " . . . focus only on those characteristics of speech that are common to the Black community."[3] These shared features

---

[1]Ma and Herasimchuk, "Bilingual Neighborhood," p. 436.

[2]Gerard Hoffman, "Puerto Ricans in New York: A Language-Related Ethnographic Summary," in Bilingualism in the Barrio, p. 29.

[3]Wolfram, Sociolinguistic Aspects of Assimilation, p. 2.

are only a part of the PRE dialect; we must yet determine what features are unique to PRE speakers, i.e. not shared by Blacks. Furthermore, the major field work for Labov's study was done outside of the school setting in South Central Harlem which is almost exclusively a Black community.

Because of the dearth of studies dealing specifically with Puerto Rican English and the great abundance of studies of Black English, some supportive data for the comments in this paper will be drawn from research on non-standard dialects in general and from research on Black English in particular. Raven McDavid, Jr. argues the case for viewing these two dialectal situations as comparable:

> A complex dialectal problem develops when there is another language in use at home, whether Acadian French, . . . or Puerto Rican Spanish. This is often further complicated when the students or the parents first encounter English as a non-standard type. However, these are best treated as differences in degree and not in kind.[1] (Italics added.)

Sometimes a curious logic has influenced the lack of attention to Puerto Ricans' language and language development. In a summary of a 1964 conference at Bloomington, Indiana on the subject of Social Dialects and Language Learning, Albert H. Marckwardt admitted:

> We have given relatively little attention to language problems other than those of the Negro in urban areas. . . . there are many other groups for whom acquisition of the standard language is of the greatest importance: the Puerto Ricans in New York . . . We all know that these people cannot be neglected; we are all aware that our language problem extends to all the socially underprivileged, but it must be confessed the particular urgency of securing

---

[1]Raven I. McDavid, Jr., "Dialectology and the Teaching of Reading," in Teaching Black Children to Read, p. 12.

> equality of opportunity for non-whites tended to focus our attention upon this one phase of the language problem.[1]

Three years later, after completing his monumental study of Black English, Labov stated:

> . . . there is an order of priority, based on the numbers of people involved, the extent of neglect, and the degree of structural differences involved. In these terms, the educational problem of the Negro children in large cities must be considered most pressing; secondly, those of Puerto Rican and Mexican children from Spanish-speaking homes; and third, the problems of white youth from Appalachian backgrounds and other underprivileged areas.[2]

As regards "equality of opportunity for non-whites," it seems that Marckwardt believes either that all Puerto Ricans are white or that they do not suffer from discrimination or limited opportunities. Both of these assumptions are patently false. In Labov's scheme for determining priority for dealing with educational problems of minority groups, Puerto Ricans in New York City should figure very highly. They constitute almost 24% of the school population and over 50% in some school districts. (See Table 1)

---

[1]Albert H. Marckwardt, "Review of the Conference," in Social Dialects and Language Learning, p. 153.

[2]Labov, "Some Sources of Reading Problems for Negro Speakers of Nonstandard English," in Teaching Black Children to Read, p. 29.

Non-Standard Black English Dialect

The features of Black English have been fairly systematically identified, usually in terms of differences from Standard English. It will be useful, for a later comparison with PRE, to list the more distinctive linguistic features of Black English. Not all of these are unique to BE, but may appear in other non-standard or standard dialects of English.

Pronunciation[1]

1. Reduction of word-final consonant clusters. Test, desk, hand and build are pronounced tes', des', han', and buil'. These are monomorphemic words but reduction also takes place in clusters which are suffixes. Thus, messed and looked may be rendered as mes' and look' (Her hair was mes' up.) This rule only operates when both members of the cluster are either voiced or voiceless.

2. Plural formation. Because the final consonant sound is removed, words like wasp, ghost, desk and test may be pluralized as if they ended in a sibilant, as in SE, with -es. Thus, wasses, ghoses, desses and tesses.

3. th sounds. Pronunciation of th is dependent on where it occurs in a word and what sounds occur next to it:
   a. word-initial position: /d/ may be substituted for /ð/ (dese, dem for these, them)
      /t/ may be substituted for /θ/ (tink, tin for think thin)
      /f/ may be substituted for /θ/ if it is followed by r (free, froat for three, throat)
   b. within a word: /θ/ is pronounced /f/ nuf'n - nothing
      /ð/ is pronounced /v/ bruva - brother
   c. word-final position: most usually /f/ for /θ/ and /v/ for /ð/ but some variation depending on the preceding sound

---

[1]Ralph W. Fasold and Walt Wolfram, "Some Linguistic Features of Negro Dialect," in Teaching Standard English in the Inner City, ed. Ralph W. Fasold and Roger W. Shuy, Urban Language Series, no. 6 (Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1970), pp. 43-58.

4. Post-vocalic r. Generally reduced to a vowel-like sound, even when the next word begins with a vowel (Sistuh Elly for Sister Elly), or intervocalically (Ca'ol for Carol)

5. Post-vocalic l. Generally reduced to a vowel-like sound. Before a consonant it is not pronounced (hep for help)

6. -ing suffix. -in' is substituted (singin' for singing)

7. Influence of nasals on i and e. Pin and pen are pronounced the same because these vowels do not contrast before nasal consonants.

8. Vowel glides generally not pronounced. /tahm/ for time (/tarm/)

9. Indefinite articles. a is used regardless of whether the following word begins with a vowel or a consonant

10. Pronunciation of ask is axe.

Grammar[1]

1. -ed suffix. Usually not pronounced because of pronunciation rules. In verbs ending in /t/ or /d/ -id may be added or the ending may be reduced to /d/ alone.

2. Irregular verbs. There is a distinction between present and past tense forms. The occurrence of sentences like Yesterday he give it to me are rare. However, some verbs, like say, do not change form.

3. Omission of auxiliary have in perfect tenses. I been here and He gone home for I've been here and He's gone home.

4. Simple past instead of past participle. They have came for They have come. You should've took it for You should've taken it.

5. Third person singular present tense markers. The s inflectional ending is not a part of the present tense paradigm in BE. All forms of the present tense are the same: I go, you go, he go, she go, we go, they go.

6. Have and do. Remain unchanged in third person singular present tense. He have a bike. He do his homework.

---

[1]Ibid., pp. 58-82.

7. Auxiliary don't. Used with all persons. Doesn't is absent because does is absent from BE.

8. Gonna. There are three phonetic realizations of gonna when the subject of the sentence is I: I'mana go, I'mon go, and I'ma go. When the subject of the sentence is other than I, it may be pronounced He gon go. This is similar to standard English I'ngna go or I'ngona go.

9. Future will. In contracted form it is usually deleted by pronunciation rules. He'll be here is He be here.

10. Invariant be. There are no inflected forms. Be is used regardless of the subject: I be here, you be here, he be here, etc.

11. Distributive or non-tense be. Usually misunderstood by speakers of SE. It denotes an intermittent distribution in time, a repeated occurrence. I be good means the speaker is only good at times.

12. Absence of be. Because of deletion of 's and 're contracted endings by pronunciation rules, the verb seems to be absent. He going. We writing.

13. Use of ain't. For negative forms of is, am, are and auxiliaries have and has, ain't is used. Ain't sometimes corresponds to SE didn't.

14. Multiple negation. SE allows negatives to be expressed only once in a sentence; BE has no such restriction. Complex rules govern precisely at which places in the sentence the negative may occur.

15. Possessive 's. Usually not pronounced. The boy hat for the boy's hat.

16. Mines. Regularization of first person pronoun to conform to other pronouns.

17. Absence of plural suffix. Occurs occasionally when the noun is preceded by a quantifier: two cent for two cents.

18. Regular plurals with irregular nouns: two deers, two foots.

19. Double plurals. Childrens, mens, womens.

20. Absence of preposed auxiliary. You coming with us? for Are you coming with us? Where you sit? for Where do you sit?

21. Pronominal apposition. My brother he go to school.

22. Existential it. It is used in place of there. Is it a bus stop around here? for Is there a bus stop around here?

Puerto Rican English

Wolfram also attempted to isolate the linguistic features of PRE that were influenced by assimilation of BE.[1] In order to attribute with certainty particular PRE features to the influence of BE, he limited his analysis to those items which are unique to BE among the various dialects of New York City. In other words, an item like *-in* substitution for *-ing* was not considered because it occurs in the speech of white speakers of non-standard dialects, as well. Because many characteristics of BE also typify other non-standard dialects these had to be eliminated from consideration. For example, " . . . the frequent absence of post-vocalic *r* in items like *four*, *sister* and *board* are phenomena widespread among the various white and black non-standard varieties of English."[2] If this absence also occurs in PRE it does not necessarily mean that it is acquired from Blacks.

It was also necessary to eliminate from consideration those features of PRE which might be due to interference from Spanish in order not to confuse interference with assimilation phenomena.[3]

---

[1]Wolfram, "Overlapping Influence and Linguistic Assimilation in Second-Generation Puerto Rican English," in *Sociolinguistics in Cross-Cultural Analysis*, ed. David M. Smith and Roger W. Shuy (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1972), pp. 15-46.

[2]Idem, "Parameters of Language Assimilation," p. 152.

[3]Ibid., p. 153.

The features that showed the effects of BE assimilation are:

1. Morpheme-final /θ/ realized as /f/. toof for tooth.
2. Reduction of up-glide in diphthongs. time realized as /ta^{ə}m/ instead of /taɪm/
3. Distributive be. Sometimes he be nice for Sometimes he is nice.
4. Post-vocalic syllable-final /d/ deletion. He's a goo' boy for He's a good boy.
5. Deletion of final members of consonant clusters. Test, ground, and wild are pronounced as tes', groun' and wil'.[1]

Because of Wolfram's research design, the number of variables of PRE he studied was very small.

For educational reasons and for further linguistic analysis it will be necessary to list all the features that Wolfram omitted, whether they are caused by assimilation of BE or other non-standard varieties or by interference from Spanish. What is crucial is to have as complete a description of PRE as we have for BE.

Wolfram also notes that certain features of PRE are not attributable either to Spanish interference or to assimilation of BE but are produced by the development of new rules which " . . . might not be related isomorphically to one of the source languages or dialects."[2]

One such rule is for pleonastic tense marking in which tense may be marked both in the negative auxiliary and in the

---

[1]Ibid., pp. 153-157; Idem, "Overlapping Influence and Assimilation," pp. 24-33.

[2]Idem, "Overlapping Influence and Assimilation," p. 40.

in the main verb:

I didn't did it.
I didn't meant to say it that way.
We didn't never called it a game.

He noted that such usage was not categorical but varied with the SE forms for past tense in the speech of any one informant. Thus, the same person who said He didn't came also said I didn't even see him.[1]

This feature cannot be dismissed as language interference or defined as hypercorrection; " . . . it must be described as an integral part of the tense system for one variety of PRE."[2]

It remains to be discovered how many other features can be isolated in PRE.

Speakers of PRE are no exception to the rule that " . . . the children of every nationality and ethnic group develop a fairly complete language system by the age of four or five."[3]

It is now up to linguists and teachers to study these children and ascertain exactly what that system is.

---

[1]Ibid.

[2]Ibid., p. 42

[3]Center for Applied Linguistics, "Dialect as a Social Determinant" (Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1974). (Mimeographed.)

Facts and Myths About Non-Standard Dialects

The idea of "verbal deprivation"

Further investigation is required to isolate the systematic features of PRE. Until a full-scale scientific study is made of PRE, identifying its grammatical, lexical and phonological features and providing data for comparison with Black English and with Puerto Rican Spanish, classroom teachers will have to rely on their own analyses of this dialect, based on their observation of students' speech.

It is precisely at this point that problems may occur. The dispassionate non-judgmental view that teachers had of Spanish-influenced transfer errors becomes a pejorative assessment of non-standard errors. While the Spanish-dominant child's behavior is seen as conforming to a different, but valid linguistic system, the dialect speaker's language is seen as a deviation from a systematic norm.[1] The very words used to describe the dialect imply a negative judgment. The non-standard is often believed to have no grammar or to be illogical.

Theories of verbal deprivation and cognitive deficiencies which at one time were popular in explaining the "culturally disadvantaged" or "language deprived" child, have been discredited by linguists who showed that: 1) no language is structurally better than any other; rather, each is a

---

[1]Stewart, "Foreign Language Teaching Methods in Quasi-Foreign Language Situations," in Teaching Standard English in the Inner City, p. 11.

well-ordered system of phonological, grammatical and lexical patterns and 2) all children by the age of five have developed language; they have learned the rules of their linguistic environment.[1]

The concept of a child who comes to school verbally deficient is absurd today (see p. 32 below). Yet it took a great deal of time, effort and print for the language of Black children to be regarded as merely divergent and not faulty, sub-standard, sloppy, lazy, pathological or inherently evil. Some would say the battle has not been won yet. By contrast, the campaign on behalf of recognizing the verbal development of Puerto Rican children when they enter school has not even begun in earnest.

It would be very revealing to ascertain how many teachers whose consciousness has been raised regarding the linguistic integrity of Black English still harbor doubts about the systematic, rule-governed behavior of PRE speakers.

The Effect of Teachers' Ignorance of Students' Dialect

Willingness on the part of the teacher to acknowledge that Standard English is not inherently better, merely different, from a particular non-standard dialect does not in the least assure successful teaching, however.

In order to be truly effective in improving students' skills in Standard English, the teacher should have an adequate

---

[1]Joan C. Baratz, "Teaching Reading in an Urban Negro School System," in Teaching Black Children to Read, p. 96.

knowledge of the students' own language variety. Most proponents of this view have been arguing from the reference point of Black English. Joan Baratz exemplifies this position:

> It seems clear that a structural knowledge of non-standard vernacular and the ways it can interfere with learning to speak and read Standard English are indispensable to teaching ghetto Negro children.[1]

Labov argues for the need to overcome the problem of "reciprocal ignorance" characterized by:

> ignorance of Standard English rules on the part of speakers of nonstandard English
>
> ignorance of nonstandard English rules on the part of teachers and text writers.[2]

He feels that the difficulty lies not so much in the differences between the teacher's speech and the students' but in the ignorance of those differences.[3]

Baratz does not think it unreasonable to suggest that teachers of Standard English learn to speak the child's dialect,[4] if only for the sensitivity it will create in them towards students' difficulties in learning a second variety of a language. This learning may not be accomplished easily, she warns, but it will deliver a concomitant lesson as well - that of the impossibility of eradicating one's native dialect by

---

[1]Ibid., p. 101.

[2]Labov, "Some Sources of Reading Problems," p. 29.

[3]Idem, The Study of Non-Standard English, p. 43.

[4]Baratz, "Educational Considerations for Teaching Standard English to Negro Children," in Teaching Standard English in the Inner City, p. 28.

learning another.[1] For those who still believe that students do not master Standard English until their own language patterns are completely erased, the folly (not to mention the glaring failure) of eradication policies will become apparent through their own experience in second dialect learning.

If the lack of knowledge on the part of the teacher is deplored with respect to Black English, how much more deplorable is the situation with respect to Puerto Rican English!

Since little information about PRE is available (see pp. 16-18 above) and probably even less has filtered down from researcher to classroom teacher, there is a real danger that Puerto Rican students' "errors" in English will be corrected in a random unsystematic way by teachers who do not recognize it as a coherent and self-contained system. This type of correction is confusing to the student.

> Unless they are put within a general framework of systemic comparison, corrections by the teacher of isolated bits of linguistic behavior are liable to be regarded by the non-standard speaker as capricious or arbitrary.[2]

Isolated and random correction of the non-standard English of Blacks and Puerto Ricans is criticized by Labov:

> . . . we have every reason to believe that we are dealing with a system in equilibrium which cannot be easily changed by pressure on any one point. Knowledge

---

[1]Ibid.

[2]Stewart, "Factors Affecting English Teaching," p. 18.

of the system as a whole is required as a first step in any educational program.[1]

The Effect of Teachers' Ignorance of General Linguistic Principles

The lack of sophistication among classroom teachers regarding proven linguistic facts was demonstrated by the results of a study conducted with urban teachers of disadvantaged minority-group children.[2] These teachers were asked to identify the language problems of their students. "The results showed a very low correlation of response to reality."[3]

Eighty per cent of the teachers commented that the children have a limited vocabulary (". . . a vocabulary of about a hundred and some words, I'd say"[4]) while others said that some students could not talk at all when they came to school. They seemed to equate a lack of school vocabulary

---

[1]William Labov, Paul Cohen, Clarence Robins, and John Lewis, A Study of the Non-Standard English of Negro and Puerto Rican Speakers in New York City, vol. 1: Phonological and Grammatical Analysis; vol. 2: The Use of Language in the Speech Community; 2 vols. (Cooperative Research Project No. 3288, Office of Education; Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 028 423, 1968), 1:24.

[2]Anne E. Hughes, "An Investigation of Some Sociolinguistic Phenomena in the Vocabulary, Pronunciation and Grammar of Detroit Pre-School Children, their Parents and Teachers" (Ed.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1967), quoted in Roger W. Shuy, "Teacher Training and Urban Language Problems," in Teaching Standard English in the Inner City, p. 121.

[3]Shuy, "A Linguistic Background for Developing Beginning Reading Materials for Black Children," in Teaching Black Children to Read, p. 119.

[4]Idem, "Teacher Training," p. 122.

with a lack of overall vocabulary.[1] One teacher said the students have trouble with pronunciation because ". . . they fail to use their teeth and tongue and their lips."[2] Several teachers characterized the students' greatest problem as their inability to speak in sentences or complete thoughts.[3]

These statements contradict what we know of children's pre-school language development. A definition of basic linguistic issues in a publication of the Center for Applied Linguistics states:

> Every normal child acquires the basic grammatical, vocabulary, and sound system of his native language on a regular developmental or maturational timetable (allowing for a range of individual differences) independently of intelligence.
>
> a. No group of normal children has ever been found to be "alingual" or to consistently express themselves "illogically."
>
> . . . . . .
>
> c. The variety of a language used by a speaker, whether standard or non-standard, bears no relation to his intelligence, or to his capacity for learning or logical thought.[4]

The comments obtained by Hughes merely reflect the teachers' naive perceptions, their imprecise and vague definitions of the problem, their ignorance of the patterns of inner-city speech and the interference of pedagogical folklore which passes as knowledge.[5]

---

[1]Ibid., p. 121.

[2]Ibid., p. 124.

[3]Ibid., p. 122.

[4]Center for Applied Linguistics, "Linguistic Issues in Bilingual Education" (Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1974). (Mimeographed.)

[5]Shuy, "Teacher Training," p. 125.

The margin of error in diagnosing student language problems might be greater in the case of teachers of Puerto Rican English speakers. The students' language idiosyncrasies may be attributed incorrectly to their Spanish-language background and consequently teachers may believe that these students are just beginning to learn English, that English is a new language for them. The nature of their non-standard dialect is very likely unknown, especially in view of the relatively recent and until now meager attention given to PRE by linguists.

Yet the teachers studied by Hughes were all regular common branches teachers without special linguistic training. One would expect trained and licensed ESL teachers to have views more in conformity with linguistic principles.

In order to test this hypothesis, a questionnaire was given to ESL teachers of elementary grade Puerto Rican students; it asked for the same kind of information requested by Hughes. The results of this questionnaire will be discussed in detail in Chapter III of this paper, but it is very satisfying to note that most of the ESL teachers surveyed made insightful comments based on a good understanding of some of the principles underlying the analysis of standard and non-standard dialects.

The Need for Useful Linguistic Data

In any field there is always a lag between theoretical studies and their transformation into practical application. This is no less true in the field of linguistics and language learning, where research by psychologists, sociolinguists and anthropologists has had little direct influence on teaching methods and materials. The literature on child language acquisition, for example, or on non-standard dialects is vast but " . . . specific applications to pedagogy have been few."[1] It is hardly an exaggeration to say that "linguistic theory can undergo a revolution without an analogous shift in classroom practices or curricula."[2] This lag may be illustrated by the entrenched popularity of audio-lingual methods among ESL teachers long after the development of cognitive-code theory by respected linguists.[3]

Teachers have been accused by linguists of being behind the times, slow to accept new ideas , etc.

> Certain assumptions of linguists and anthropologists seem to place them several steps ahead of educational psychologists who, for example, have put forth dangerous

---

[1]Board of Education of the City of New York, Non-standard Dialect (Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1968), p. vii.

[2]Gloria Paulik Sampson, "A Real Challenge to ESL Methodology," TESOL Quarterly 11 (September, 1977): 242.

[3]Ibid.

ideas about cultural and verbal deprivation of disadvantaged children.[1]

The reason for this seeming chasm between theorists and practitioners is not entirely the fault of the latter. Part of the distance between the two groups is created by a feeling of " . . . elitism within the field of linguistics."[2] There have been few studies on issues of immediate concern to educators, such as that of the cultural or social uses of language,[3] or the analysis of dialects of English other than Black English, such as PRE.[4] Labov points out that not much work has been done in the area of discourse analysis.[5] Rather, studies of social dialects have tended to deal with the correlation of discrete phonological features to social status[6] or with the use of a particular dialect in a particular setting or domain.[7]

More importantly, ". . . very little sociolinguistic research has been done in the school setting."[8]

---

[1]Roger W. Shuy and Ralph W. Fasold, "Contemporary Emphases in Sociolinguistics," in Sociolinguistics in Cross-Cultural Analysis, p. 2.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Fraser, Non-Standard English, p. 8.

[4]Ibid., p. 16.

[5]Labov, The Study of Nonstandard English, p. 54.

[6]Idem, The Social Stratification of English in New York City (Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1966).

[7]Fishman et al., Bilingualism in the Barrio.

[8]Labov, The Study of Nonstandard English, p. 61.

The only studies of non-standard dialects have been of two types: 1) carried out by linguists outside of school and 2) carried out by psychologists and educational researchers within school but usually in a text/interview situation that is artificial at best and may be unreliable.[1] No direct observation of teaching/learning situations has been attempted. This failure to collect samples of natural classroom speech is a severe limitation on the uses to which the data may be put to benefit classroom teachers.

In addition, and perhaps more seriously, what has been done is usually not clearly presented in terms a non-specialist or untrained layman can read and understand.[2] Many informative reports have limited audiences because of their highly technical " . . . cumbersome notation system."[3]

There is a great need, then, for cooperation among teachers and linguists, sociologists, anthropologists and psychologists. The teachers can define the educational problems which need urgent solution, for example, teaching Standard English to speakers of PRE, and the researchers can present the results of their work in terms comprehensible and useful to educators.

---

[1]Ibid., p. 50.

[2]Fraser, Non-Standard English, p. 20.

[3]Ibid., p. 12.

Expectations for Students Learning Standard English

Teachers' Attitudes

Many studies have been conducted to determine the effect of teacher attitudes on student learning. The expectations of the teacher may influence to a significant degree the success or failure of the learners. This was demonstrated conclusively in the classic study by Rosenthal, Pygmalion in the Classroom (1958). Subsequent research has pointed " . . . to the role that dialect plays in generating the teacher's expectations."[1] Of course, the teachers' expectations will determine how they behave towards students and, ultimately, how the students behave and learn. All too often the child's use of

> . . . forms other than Standard English has a negative effect - not because linguistic differences per se would prevent the child from learning to read but because they affect how the teacher behaves toward him.[2]
>
> Data suggest that urban language differences . . . do have a significant influence on a teacher's expectations and hence on the learning environment.[3]

In his exhaustive study, The Social Stratification of English in New York City, Labov discusses the language attitudes of several socio-economic classes. He discovered that among the lower-middle class, particularly among women, there is a

---

[1]John J. Gumperz and Eduardo Hernandez-Chavez, "Bilingualism, Bidialectalism and Classroom Interaction," in Functions of Language in the Classroom, ed. Courtney B. Cazden, Vera P. John and Dell Hymes (New York: Teachers College Press, 1972), p. 101.

[2]Ibid., p. 102.

[3]Ibid., p. 105.

high degree of intolerance toward stigmatized forms of speech. " . . . women respond in a much more extreme fashion to subjective reaction tests than men and are far more prone to stigmatize nonstandard usage."[1] This is an especially interesting finding since the majority of New York City teachers are drawn from the lower-middle class and most are women.[2]

The intolerant reaction may be based on an inaccurate perception caused by a stereotyping process described by Labov: "A person who uses a stigmatized form 20 to 30% of the time will be heard as using this form all of the time."[3]

A dual value system may in effect be operating: an intellectual acceptance of language diversity based on a conscious attitude, while at the same time an emotional and sub-conscious reaction to certain stigmatized features.

The problem of intolerance becomes increasingly complex in view of the " . . . sociolinguistic principle that <u>those who use the highest degree of a stigmatized form in their own casual speech are quickest to stigmatize it in the speech of others</u>."[4] This means that a teacher may react " . . . in an extreme, sometimes unrealistic fashion"[5] to a child's use of a feature that

---

[1]Labov, <u>The Study of Nonstandard English</u>, p. 33.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Idem, "Sources of Reading Problems," p. 34.

[4]Idem, <u>The Study of Nonstandard English</u>, p. 32.

[5]Ibid.

appears in the teacher's own speech. This applies particularly to pronunciation features, for example, the failure to pronounce /ŋ/ at the end of -ing verb forms: /sɪŋɪn/ for /sɪŋɪŋ/. It is highly unlikely that a teacher's casual and unmonitored speech would be free of such stigmatized forms, yet the same teacher may be a crusader for /ɪŋ / pronunciation among her students.

It should also be noted that the lower-middle class was found to have the greatest tendency to "hypercorrect" their own speech and such anomalies as He gave it to my friend and I or Whom did you say is calling? are by no means uncommon in the speech of English teachers. Hypercorrection is a form of style-shifting characteristic of second-ranking groups (lower-middle class) in many communities. It is directly related to the degree of linguistic insecurity.[1]

Needless to say, the effects of such language behaviors on the part of ESL teachers, unless carefully self-monitored and brought to conscious awareness, can be devastating to pupils. They will be confused by the teacher's contradictory behavior.

---

[1]Labov, The Study of Nonstandard English, p. 27.

Super-Standard

A related issue is the role of "super-standard English"[1] in classroom settings, i.e. the pronunciations or syntactical forms that are recognized as "correct" by native speakers but are hardly ever used in speech or are restricted to only the most formal level of style.[2] An example of such a form is the sentence, The only one who can do that is I.

Theoretically, most textbooks designed for ESL beginners emphasize spoken communication skills and natural language and should be free of such formal and artificial examples. Nevertheless, " . . . probably every teacher . . . has been in the uncomfortable position of teaching grammatical norms from which his or her own speech 'falls short.'"[3]

With reference to Puerto Rican students of ESL, any insistence on using "super-standard" forms is not only misguided, but also cruel, if English-speaking peers, teachers and other members of the school community do not use those forms themselves.

Realistic Standard

A teacher's expectations for students learning Standard English should be realistically based on accurate perceptions of

---

[1]Richard W. Schmidt and Carol F. McCreary, "Standard and Super-Standard English," TESOL Quarterly 11 (December, 1977): 415.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Ibid.

the "standard" usage of the community.

In a statement of goals and desired outcomes in the teaching of Standard English speech, for example, " . . . mastery of basic sentence and intonation patterns and of grammatical forms used in adult speech in school" a curriculum committee of the New York City Board of Education recommended that:

> Realistic expectations for speakers of a non-standard dialect should take into account that many speakers of a standard dialect have not reached all these goals in equal measure.[1]

In other words, we should not expect the students in the ESL class to conform to an ideal standard which the rest of the school does not conform to. Fasold and Wolfram offer the same caution to teachers of Standard English:

> A good rule of thumb for a teacher to follow is to carefully and honestly reflect on his own usage in casual conversation and not to insist on any usage on the part of his pupils which he does not find in his own casual speech.[2]

We might add that it is just as important not to insist on the suppression of any usage on the part of the pupils that <u>does</u> exist in the teacher's own casual speech.

In order to identify the errors (deviations from Standard English) that students in a particular school make, it is necessary to identify the actual Standard English used by the teacher and the administration of that school.[3]

---

[1]Board of Education, <u>Nonstandard Dialect</u>, p. 3.

[2]Fasold and Wolfram, "Linguistic Features of Negro Dialect," p. 82.

[3]Labov, "Acquisition of Standard English," p. 99.

What Labov means by this is that there are no arbitrary prescriptive norms of what is "correct" Standard English; "standard" can only be defined in a social context. "Standardization . . . refers to social attitudes toward the language and not to grammatical structure."[1] The lack of a universally accepted definition of Standard English in the United States is partially due to wide regional variation. Fraser complains about the "impressionistic" definitions of Standard English.[2] What is considered non-standard in New York City, for example, the lack of discrimination between the vowels of pin and pen among Black English speakers, may be a regional difference and, in fact, is standard usage in other parts of this country.

There is also a distinction between formal standard, which is prescribed by grammar and usage books, and the real spoken standard of the educated middle-class. Formal standard usage avoids prepositions at the end of sentences, for example, yet such usage is common in what we normally refer to as SE.

A proper perspective on the use of non-standard, standard and super-standard English may be gained by a discussion of linguistic appropriateness in styles and domains.

Style

The real or apparent differences between the teacher's

---

[1]Center for Applied Linguistics, "Dialect as a Social Determinant," [p. 3].

[2]Fraser, Non-Standard English, p. 1.

speech (Standard English) and the students' (Non-standard English) do not lie in the presence or absence of certain linguistic features exclusively but in the frequency of use of these variables. "Dialects differ primarily in the way in which they use certain linguistic variables, i.e. in the distribution of frequency along the stylistic range."[1] A teacher who speaks SE and student who speaks NSE may both exhibit a particular linguistic feature in their speech but one may use it only rarely and the other nearly always.

> . . . the various socio-linguistic variables . . . are rarely confined to one or another dialect but usually wander from one end of the stylistic range to the other.[2]

This means that in unguarded moments a teacher may use such forms as We're gonna go or Where you going? Similarly, a student who normally uses ain't may say isn't or aren't when called upon in class.

This variability is sometimes "dismissed" by the distinction between linguistic competence and performance, although it is probably a more complex phenomenon.[3]

The problem of some speakers of non-standard English who come from lower socio-economic groups is that they usually have a very restricted stylistic range in English. They may not know how to shift to the more formal or standard style of

---

[1]Labov, The Study of Nonstandard English, p. 21.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Idem, Nonstandard English of Negro and Puerto Rican Speakers, 1:10.

We're going to go or Where are you going? as the teacher does. Rather, they use the non-standard form much more consistently.

Linguistic Appropriateness

One of the basic assumptions about social dialects, such as PRE, is that they are not inherently inferior to Standard English but merely functionally different. " . . . from a social viewpoint . . . some dialects are considered more valuable than others in certain contexts."[1] The "domain appropriateness" of a language variety takes into account the place, the time and the persons involved in any social interaction.[2] All of these will determine which language is more socially useful.

If this assumption is accepted and the social reality of American society recognized, then these points must be acknowledged:

1) a non-standard dialect may be appropriate in a particular social setting

2) Standard English is appropriate in the school setting

3) a child may learn to use Standard English in school and still use a non-standard dialect in other settings

In other words, it is possible to add to one's linguistic repertoire without replacing one's native dialect.

---

[1]Baratz, "Educational Considerations," p. 25.

[2]Fishman, "Sociolinguistic Perspective on the Study of Bilingualism," in Bilingualism in the Barrio, p. 568.

It is especially important for teachers to appreciate the additive nature of learning a Standard dialect.[1] Teachers are urged to adopt as their goal " . . . adding a new dialect to the pupil's linguistic ability, rather than trying to eradicate his 'bad' speech."[2] Teachers who despair over students who revert to ain't and mines as soon as they leave the English class are missing the point. To expect the students to carry over into peer group and family settings the Standard English used in class is unrealistic. Even if it were possible, it would create incongruous, inappropriate language situations. The use of non-standard forms in the schoolyard is appropriate to the domain.

Teachers should realize that if students are able to change their speech style according to the social setting, if they can adapt to the social context by saying mine in the classroom and mines outside, then they are capable of code-switching, a highly useful communication skill.

---

[1]Board of Education, Nonstandard Dialect, p. 1.

[2]Walt Wolfram and Ralph W. Fasold, "Toward Reading Materials for Speakers of Black English: Three Linguistically Appropriate Passages," in Teaching Black Children to Read, p. 144.

Teaching Standard English

There is considerable evidence that very young children do not have sufficient awareness of the social variables of language, of the value of more desirable social variants, or of the need for acquiring such variants to really benefit from instruction in Standard English. Older children and adolescents are much more receptive to change in this respect. This phenomenon has been noted by several writers. Roger Shuy states that there is no proof that " . . . children have any great conscious awareness of the fine distinctions of the social dimensions of language."[1] Wolfram and Fasold have questioned whether Standard English can be taught in school at all, especially in the lower grades.[2]

These views are based on the findings of William Labov who reported that the social significance of the dialect characteristics of his peers gradually becomes apparent to the adolescent speaker. It is only at the age of 14 or 15 that children begin to respond subjectively to language with patterns that resemble the adult reaction patterns. Before that age,

> . . . roughly ages 5 to 12, the child learns the use of the local dialect in a form consistent with that of his immediate group of friends . . . The peer group dialect characteristics become automatic in everyday speech and the influence of the parents is submerged under the influence of the peer group.[3]

---

[1]Shuy, "Developing Beginning Reading Materials," p. 119.

[2]Wolfram and Fasold, "Toward Reading Materials for Black English," p. 143.

[3]Labov, "Acquisition of Standard English," p. 91.

Labov then comments rather pointedly that this is the period during which the child begins to read in school, suggesting that the peer group dialect is an obstacle to reading success.

Linguists, educators and psychologists generally agree, on the other hand, that young children can learn English as a second language exceptionally well, even without direct instruction, as the immersion programs in Montreal have proved.[1] Why then these grave doubts about the merits of teaching them Standard English?

Simply stated, a dialect is not a foreign language. Learning a second dialect is not the same as learning a second language. "Very different teaching techniques are called for in the two cases, because of the fact that they involve fundamentally dissimilar relationships between the learner and the language being taught."[2]

Both psychologically and linguistically there is a much clearer demarcation between two languages than between two dialects of the same language, such as PRE and SE.

> Usually, when we switch from one foreign language to another, there is a clear break between the two, but when we switch from one dialect to another, it is often hard to identify where the switch occurs.[3]

---

[1]This belief that young children learn languages faster, better and more easily than older ones is being challenged in current research by Wallace Lambert in Montreal, reported in "Some Cognitive and Social Consequences of Being Bilingual," paper presented at Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics, Washington, D.C., 16 March 1978.

[2]Stewart, "Quasi-Foreign Language Situations," p. 10.

[3]Idem, "Factors Affecting English Teaching," p. 9.

Even the youngest speaker of a language like Spanish or French, for example, knows when he is speaking his language and when he is speaking, or attempting to speak, English. However, because dialects are basically similar in their grammar and sound systems, their many similarities may obscure their areas of difference, confusing the speaker as to when he is speaking his own language variety and when he is speaking Standard English. At one level (vocabulary, for example) the two varieties might be so close that the learner could be considered to have native or near-native command of that aspect, yet at another level, such as grammar, the two systems might be so different that foreign-language teaching procedures would be warranted.[1] The use of techniques of contrastive analysis is usually recommended for teaching English as a second dialect so that students may see the differences between their language and SE in a systematic way. Unless the student knows where his dialect agrees with the standard dialect and where the two differ, he will be unable to tell that his I don't like it, for example, is acceptable, "correct" English, while his He don't like it is not.

It was Stewart who coined the term "quasi-foreign language situation" to describe the teaching of English as a second dialect and he points out that this means that the Negro-dialect speaker may have just as much difficulty in acquiring SE as the speaker of Spanish.[2]

---

[1]Stewart, "Quasi-Foreign Language Situations," p. 11.

[2]Idem, " Use of Negro Dialect in the Teaching of Reading," in Teaching Black Children to Read, p. 168.

> . . . the subtlety of the structural differences between the two forms of English [standard and non-standard], masked as they are by the many similarities, may make it almost impossible for the speaker of Negro dialect to tell which patterns are characteristic of non-standard dialect, and which ones are not.[1]

Baratz elaborates on this by saying that the non-standard dialect speaker, may in fact have more difficulty, because " . . . in many instances the student does not know where non-standard English leaves off and standard English begins."[2]

> Bidialectalism may actually be harder to acquire than bilingualism. All scholars have agreed that it is harder to keep two similar languages apart than two very different ones.[3]

This discussion of language learning difficulties has been based on a theory of contrastive analysis, in which students' errors in acquiring a second language are caused by interference from their native language and teaching the new language takes into account the structure of the students' own variety in order to anticipate and correct errors most effectively.

This theory has been seriously challenged by proponents of the creative construction hypothesis, most notably Heidi Dulay and Marina Burt.[4] Their contention is that second language

---

[1]Idem, "Use of Negro Dialect," p. 168.

[2]Baratz, "Educational Considerations," p. 33.

[3]Einar Haugen, "Bilingualism and Bidialectalism," in Social Dialects and Language Learning, p. 125.

[4]Heidi Dulay and Marina Burt, "You Can't Learn Without Goofing: An Analysis of Children's Second Language 'Errors'" (Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 066 981, 1972), p. 3.

acquisition is similar to first language acquisition. (They also refer to their theory as the L_1L_2 hypothesis.) They claim that transfer plays little or no role and "goofs" are caused by the child's actively seeking to organize and generalize about the structure of the target language.[1] They say that the strategies of L_2 acquisition are similar to those of L_1 acquisition and that, therefore, the learning sequence of L_2 syntactic structures is similar to the corresponding L_1 syntactic development.[2]

Since all the research supporting the L_1L_2 hypothesis has been carried out with children who are learning a second language, not a second dialect, it is not possible to say with certainty whether this theory accounts for the "goofs" of Puerto Rican English speakers learning Standard English. A good description of these goofs would enable us to categorize them according to Burt and Dulay's classification system:

> 1) interference-like goofs - traceable to native L_1 structure and are not found in speech of native learners of the target language (L_2), e.g. hers pants from sus pantalones in Spanish.
>
> 2) L_1 developmental goofs - not traceable to native L_1 structure but are found in speech of native L_2 learners, e.g. brang, mouses, etc.
>
> 3) ambiguous goofs - can be either type 1 or 2, i.e. can be explained by both contrastive analysis and L_1L_2 hypothesis.
>
> 4) unique goofs - not traceable to native L_1 structure and are also not found in speech of native L_2 learners, e.g. He name is Victor.[3]

---

[1] Dulay and Burt, "Goofing," p. 3.

[2] Ibid., p. 20.

[3] Ibid., p. 30.

It is beyond the scope of this paper to attempt such a description of the "goofs" of Puerto Rican English speakers. A potentially fruitful avenue of research would be in identifying interference-like goofs in the speech of PRE speakers that are traceable both to Spanish and to Black English and to compare the number, or the proportion of these, with goofs of other types.

Teaching English to Puerto Rican students who speak a non-standard variety may lead to misunderstandings between teacher and student about the difference between form and substance (words and meaning), that do not occur with students learning a second language.

Unlike those who do not speak English at all and are just learning the basic structures, these dialect speakers need to know that what they are saying means something; they demand relevance. They are accustomed to using English as a means of communication; they assume that language is for communication and they do communicate effectively in English. Unfortunately, in second language classrooms, the teacher does not always operate on the assumption that language is communication. Often the underlying assumption of the class (shared by beginning ESL students) is that language is form and that "We are here to practice the forms of English." ESL beginners do not usually mind having to say a sentence like The book is on the table or I have a red crayon even when it is more than obvious to everyone in the room that the book is indeed on the table or that the speaker does have a red crayon. Speakers of Puerto Rican English, on the contrary, do mind having to utter such redundancies.

"When all the words in a sentence sound familiar, yet add up to nothing worth saying, the exercise seems pointless to many in a second dialect class."[1] The recommendation for avoiding these pointless exercises is to increase the amount of lexical items in order to challenge the student.[2] It is likely, however, that merely increasing the amount of words will have little challenging effect, unless these words are also new to the student and require some effort to understand and use.

ESL teachers who insist on "accuracy before fluency" for second language students, must consider that second dialect speakers are already fluent in English.[3]

Undoubtedly, then, these students must be taught differently. The successful control of Standard English forms should not be pursued at the expense of meaningfulness. (Nor should meaning be forfeited for second language beginners, either, but it is especially crucial in the case of nonstandard dialect speakers, such as speakers of PRE.) To undertake a listing of recommended second dialect teaching techniques is not within the scope of this paper, yet two general points can be made. It seems clear that some sort of contrastive approach is necessary to illustrate the similarities and differences between the way

---

[1]Virginia French Allen, "A Second Dialect is Not a Foreign Language," in 20th Annual Round Table: Linguistics and the Teaching of Standard English to Speakers of Other Languages or Dialects, ed. James E. Alatis, Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics, no. 22 (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1969), p. 193.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Ibid.

students speak and the way the school expects them to speak. In addition, it seems likely that unless students are involved on an intellectual level in language learning, they will become bored or frustrated and lose interest. A lesson that is challenging to their cognitive abilities will probably be more successful than one based on language drills which can be accomplished without thinking. Teaching standard English by means of other subject content areas seems to be a way of providing this challenge.

Barriers to Acquisition of Standard English

Societal Factors

The question of teaching Standard English to non-standard dialect speakers who are members of racial minority groups (Puerto Ricans, Chicanos, Native Americans, etc.) entails much more than an analysis of linguistic, psychological or pedagogical variables.

It calls for an honest assessment, as well, of the social, economic and political realities of American society.

The basic premise of most teachers of Standard English is that language is the passport to worlds of social and economic success. This premise is challenged by some writers who believe that, in fact, the reverse is true: that social mobility is responsible for changes in language.

This issue has been analyzed in some detail by Jack C. Richards and it is worthwhile to consider the argument he presents.

If it is true, as Labov has shown rather conclusively, that many linguistic structures reflect social stratification, and that we are often able to identify the socio-economic status of an individual upon hearing him speak, we must question whether he belongs to that group because he speaks that way or whether he speaks that way because he belongs to that group. Richards asserts that it must be the latter; it is " . . . the mechanisms inherent in the social structure itself which create such marked social, economic, racial and hence linguistic

stratification."[1]

Educational difficulties often " . . . result from more than simple questions of language learning . . . [they] depend on the type and degree of interaction and acceptance available in the community."[2]

The implications of this view are ponderous.

> If speakers of non-standard dialects suddenly began speaking standard English overnight . . . [would] their economic, social, educational and political problems . . . disappear overnight?[3]

Christina Bratt Paulston posed a similar question with regard to language education for bilinguals: if these language programs are designed to provide equal educational opportunity for non-English speakers, then does this equal educational opportunity undoubtedly mean resultant social and economic success?[4]

The answers to these obviously rhetorical questions being "no," what significance do our current programs of teaching English have for students enrolled in them? Richards

---

[1]Jack C. Richards, "Some Social Aspects of Language Learning," TESOL Quarterly 6 (September, 1972), p. 251.

[2]Idem, "Social Factors, Interlanguage and Language Learning" (Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 066 966, 1973), p. 9.

[3]Idem, "Some Social Aspects," p. 251.

[4]Christina Bratt Paulston, "Theoretical Perspectives of Bilingual Education," paper presented at Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics, Washington, D.C., 16 March 1978.

challenges the " . . . efficacy of teaching programs aimed at dialect change,"[1] on the basis of his belief that the relevant variable in school achievement is not the difference between home and school dialect but the ethnic and social trends which create and perpetuate these differences.

That they are perpetuated is evident enough to anyone who has had contact with children from areas in which a non-standard dialect is the vernacular of the community.

Among speakers of PRE, the same differences from SE that are heard in the speech of adult immigrant speakers may often may be found also in the speech of young second- and third-generation speakers. These children are exposed to what Richards refers to as an interlanguage, which is a " . . . functionally adequate but socially unaccepted or non-standard variety of English."[2]

Usually the term interlanguage refers to a learner's approximative system:

> . . . the intermediate stage between the source and the target language which results from transfer, . . . strategies of communication and of learning, and over-generalization.[3]

The development of an interlanguage is marked by " . . . the generation of language norms which fall partially between those

---

[1]Richards, "Some Social Aspects," p. 251.

[2]Idem, "Interlanguage," p. 4.

[3]Ibid., p. 1.

of the mother tongue and the target language."[1]

The linguistic characteristics of interlanguage have been identified as being basically similar even in diverse settings. They include:

1) omission of marked/unmarked distinctions

2) replacement of inflected forms by uninflected forms

3) modification of preposition, auxiliary and article usage

4) apparent phonological and syntactical influence of the mother tongue[2]

We have seen that these are some of the same features identified in PRE by Wolfram (see p. 25 above).

The linguistic dimension is not as significant in itself, however, as the social dimension which accounts for the development and perpetuation of this approximative system. The features of the interlanguage may become " . . . fossilized through lack of reinforcement from native speakers."[3]

The existence of interlanguage norms was noted by Ma and Kerasimchuk in a stable bilingual community where bilinguals interact and communicate with each other, using both languages, far more frequently than they do with members of the surrounding monolingual community.

---

[1]Richards, "Some Social Aspects," p. 245.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Idem, "Interlanguage," p. 20.

> In such a community, speakers generate their own bilingual norms of correctness which may differ from the monolingual norms, particularly where there is a lack of reinforcement of these monolingual norms.[1]

These "bilingual norms" may constitute the interlanguage.

Although the interlanguage is generally the speech system of an individual, " . . . under certain conditions, this interlanguage stage may become the end point in the learning process"[2] for all speakers, and through "fossilization" become widespread throughout the community.

The prerequisite conditions for interlanguage maintenance exist to some degree in the Puerto Rican communities of New York City:

> 1) horizontal communication among people of the same status and consequent restricted contacts with speakers of SE
>
> 2) lack of intellectual or cultural networks in English. Newspapers, radio and television are in Spanish.
>
> 3) racial and ethnic barriers to social and economic mobility
>
> 4) conflict between ethnic values and identity and mainstream values[3]

These are powerful forces militating against the pupil's learning the standard dialect. The situation in which he finds himself does not make the Puerto Rican child's acquisition of SE either " . . . possible, desirable, or even helpful."[4]

---

[1]Ma and Herasimchuk, "Bilingual Neighborhood," p. 352.

[2]Richards, "Interlanguage," p. 16,

[3]Idem, "Some Social Aspects," p. 245.

[4]Ibid.

Students' perceptions of the opportunities for becoming members of the mainstream society will determine to a great extent their attitudes toward learning the language of that society, Standard English.

> If they see themselves locked out of society, anyway, then their motivation to learn English will be understandably low, especially if in so doing they risk cutting themselves off from associations they already have, namely their peers and families.[1]

It is especially important for educators to appreciate the influence of these social realities on any particular child's motivation and ultimate learning of socially accepted forms of English.

Individual Motivation

One of the factors contributing to success in second-language learning is motivation. It may be one of the most important variables. Studies have shown that " . . . motivational variables were as highly related to second-language achievement as were the indices of language aptitude."[2]

Two types of motivation have been identified by Lambert and are widely recognized among language acquisition theorists. An instrumental motivation toward language learning is one characterized by " . . . a desire to better oneself materially

---

[1]Davenport Plumer, "A Summary of Environmentalist Views and Some Educational Implications," in Frederick Williams, Language and Poverty (Chicago: n.p., 1970), p. 270, quoted in Richards, "Interlanguage," p. 18.

[2]R.C. Gardner, P.C. Smythe, R. Clement and L. Gliksman, "Second Language Learning: A Social Psychological Perspective," Canadian Modern Language Review 32 (February, 1976): 199.

by means of the language,"[1] while an integrative motive is predominantly " . . . a desire to know and become friendly with speakers of a language."[2] This desire will be affected by the student's attitude toward the speakers. "A student's motivation to learn a second language is intimately linked to his attitude toward the second language group."[3]

> . . . the underlying characterization of the integrative motive is that it reflects a high level of drive on the part of the individual to acquire the language of a valued second language community in order to facilitate communication with that group.[4]

It has generally been acknowledged that integrative motivation leads to more effective language learning than instrumental motivation. The latter " . . . can lead to a functionally adequate but non-standard dialect of English."[5]

Yet it is usually the instrumental motive that educators aim to develop in students of English. Students are encouraged to do well in English because they need it in order to succeed in school, in order to read and function in society, in order to get a good job and for other similar reasons.

It may be that even if teachers attempted to instill

---

[1]John Macnamara, "Attitudes and Learning a Second Language," in Language Attitudes: Current Trends and Prospects, p. 37.

[2]Ibid., p. 36.

[3]Gardner et al., "Psychological Perspective," p. 209.

[4]Ibid., p. 199.

[5]Richards, "Interlanguage," p. 6.

an integrative motivation in students, this attempt would fail because such motivation must be intrinsic. It can probably be fostered, however, by encouraging identification with the second-language community and by providing opportunities for contact with speakers of the target language. The need for an awareness on the part of the teacher of the children's attitudes toward the second language community is essential for effective teaching. Also needed is an awareness of the real opportunities for interaction between standard and non-standard dialect speakers and of the real possibilities for members of the minority group eventually entering the mainstream society.

It is in this sensitive area of attitude and motivation that most obstacles to learning among Puerto Rican students of English present themselves.

The factors outlined by Richards as contributing to a language community's maintenance of an interlanguage (see p. 59 above) also determine the success or failure of any given individual's language learning, as well.

> Language is so ingrained in personality that change can be effected only by individuals who are properly motivated. Such motivation must overcome these obstacles:
> - self-consciousness about the language of family, friends, community and socio-economic class
> - pressures exerted by adolescent peer groups against deviation from their accepted language pattern
> . . . . . .[1]

---

[1]Board of Education, Nonstandard Dialect, p. 2.

The role of the non-standard variety as an emblem of ethnic pride and solidarity becomes another barrier to learning the standard variety.[1]

Labov agrees when he says, "My own feeling is that the primary interference with the acquisition of Standard English stems from a conflict of value systems."[2] He points out a fact that is obviously true yet is somewhat disturbing to teachers who believe in their role as facilitators of language change:

> There are many New Yorkers . . . who feel no desire to be identified with middle class, white collar workers. . . . Identification with the class of people that includes one's friends and family is a powerful force in explaining linguistic behavior.[3]

This is a reiteration of the principle that unless a person is integratively motivated towards learning he will not do so. The conflict of values for a Puerto Rican child is caused by the school's imposition of one standard of linguistic behavior and by the peer group's imposition of another.

Labov refers more specifically to the conflict of value systems apparent in the patterns of vowel change in New York City. These patterns reveal that:

> . . . a growing minority of Negroes, Puerto Ricans, and lower class whites reject the value system implied by the dominant speech pattern and adopt a new reference

---

[1]Richards, "Interlanguage," p. 45.

[2]Labov, "Acquisition of Standard English," p. 94.

[3]Ibid.

point in which southern Negro speech is central.[1]

In analyzing the " . . . reasons why those who are exposed to Standard English, and who need the ability to use Standard English,"[2] fail to do so, Labov cites four areas of resistance to the acquisition of Standard English: " . . . structural interference, . . . opposing motivations, . . . resistance in the peer group, . . . and teacher-student interaction. . ."[3] (Italics added.)

---

[1]Labov, "Acquisition of Standard English," p. 96.

[2]Ibid., p. 103.

[3]Ibid.

CHAPTER III

REPORT OF A STUDY OF PUERTO RICAN ENGLISH SPEAKERS AND THEIR ESL TEACHERS

Purpose

In order to compare the linguistic knowledge and attitudes of trained ESL teachers with those of the regular classroom teachers in the study by Hughes (see p. 31 above), this writer designed a questionnaire to elicit information from ESL teachers about Puerto Rican students' English.[1]

In addition, this study was done with the hope of collecting new and useful data on the English spoken by Puerto Rican students in advanced ESL classes in New York City. Labov encouraged this type of original contribution by teachers to linguistic research:

> . . . the teacher can help greatly by making separate reports of the errors made by students with the foreign language background in question and giving some estimate of the relative difficulty encountered in changing these patterns.[2]

Perhaps the data outlined in our study may prove helpful in someday producing a complete linguistic description of PRE.

---

[1]See Appendix 1 for a copy of this questionnaire.

[2]Labov, "Acquisition of Standard English," p. 101.

Procedures

A questionnaire was distributed to nine teachers of English as a Second Language. They work in elementary schools in four boroughs and teach students from first through eighth grade.

The basis for selecting the sample was the location of the schools: they are all in school districts and neighborhoods with large proportions of Black and Puerto Rican students; they are all in low-income, disadvantaged or ghetto areas, such as the South Bronx (District 7), East Harlem (District 4), and Ravenswood in Long Island City (District 30); and they are all eligible for Title I funding on the basis of the low academic achievement of their pupils as well as their low income. Schools were also selected on the basis of the number of "advanced" Puerto Rican ESL students enrolled - a potential indicator of PRE speakers. Essentially, the sites were chosen for their probable enrollment of non-standard dialect speakers who have little opportunity for reinforcement of Standard English outside of school.

Table 2 lists the nine schools by district. It shows the total number of Puerto Rican students enrolled in each school and the percentage and number of these who were rated "advanced" by their teachers.

Three of these schools are located in districts which have the highest numbers of Black and Puerto Rican students in New York City - Districts 4, 7 and 9. (See Table 1.)

TABLE 2

ENROLLMENT PERCENTAGES OF PRE SPEAKERS
IN NINE SCHOOLS

School	District	Borough	Total No. Puerto Rican Students	Total No. Advanced Students	Per Cent Advanced
No. 1	1	Manhattan	35	18	50%
No. 2	4	Manhattan	27	20	74%
No. 3	6	Manhattan	10	10	100%
No. 4	7	Bronx	29	20	66%
No. 5	9	Bronx	20	4	25%
No. 6	9	Bronx	26	10	39%
No. 7	15	Brooklyn	29	14	48%
No. 8	21	Brooklyn	16	16	100%
No. 9	30	Queens	17	8	49%

SOURCE: Questionnaire, p. 1 (see Appendix 1).

The teachers were asked to identify the number of Puerto Rican students enrolled in their ESL classes. Students of other language backgrounds and other Hispanics were excluded. They were then asked to give the number of these Puerto Rican students who fit the following description: "advanced, i.e. verbally fluent in English, lifelong residents of New York City, maybe English-dominant or even English monolingual, but still in need of English instruction." The question was worded in this way in order to avoid biasing the teachers' responses in the direction of the author's own interpretation of the students' language problems.

No mention was made, therefore, of "Puerto Rican English," "Black English," "non-standard dialect," or "Standard English." For purposes of clarification, the "advanced" students were contrasted with Puerto Rican students who speak little or no English, i.e. those rated "F" on the Puerto Rican Oral Rating Scale.[1] The students referred to as "advanced" are probably closer to a "B" rating on this scale and are assumed to be speakers of Puerto Rican English.

Since the selection process focused exclusively on the location of the schools and the enrollment of potential PRE speakers, the teachers could be considered to have been randomly selected. They constitute a fairly representative sample.

Table 3 gives relevant background data on the nine teachers who returned the questionnaire.

All of these teachers are licensed by the Board of Education of the City of New York as Teachers of English as a Second Language in Elementary Schools; three have Masters degrees in Teaching English as a Second Language. The courses they have taken which relate to this discipline are listed.

Two men and seven women are represented. They range in age from under 25 to over 55. They have between two and ten years of experience teaching ESL. All but two speak a language other than English, four claiming to speak Spanish. English is the native language of all the teachers except one, who is Rumanian and Greek.

---

[1]See Appendix 3.

TABLE 4

PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL DATA ON RESPONDENTS

Sex	Age	No. of years teaching ESL	No. of other lang. spoken (* = Span. spoken)	M.A. in ESL	Courses taken							
					Descriptive Linguistics	Sociology of Language	Structure of English	Psycho-linguistics	Phonetics	Cultural Anthropology	ESL Methods	Contrastive Analysis
F	20-25	2	4			X		X			X	
M	25-35	5-10	-	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	
F	25-35	3-5	4		X				X	X	X	
F	35-45	3-5	1*	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
M	35-45	5-10	-		X				X		X	
F	35-45	5-10	2*	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
F	35-45	5-10	-		X	X					X	
F	55-65	3-5	3*		X				X	X	X	
F	55-65	5-10	2*		X				X	X	X	X

SOURCE: Personal Data Sheet on Respondents (see Appendix 2).

Responses

Differences between PRE Speakers and "F" Students

In defining the differences between "F" students and more fluent Puerto Rican students, only one teacher fell into the trap of seeing a linguistic deficiency in the latter because of their use of what she called "broken English." She said, "'F' students already possess a language to communicate their needs, feelings and desires . . . The mother tongue is pretty well developed." She appears to believe that the others do not have a fully developed linguistic system, which is counter to what language experts know about children's language acquisition.

The other eight respondents referred to differences from "F" students in terms of motivational drives, ability to participate in class and "engage in conversation" and perception of need to learn English. "F" students demonstrate all of these to a greater extent than PRE speakers, according to the teachers.

Two teachers commented on the differences between teaching English as a new language to students who have had little or no exposure to it ("F" students) and teaching it to students who have already developed a set of English speech habits:

> It is extremely difficult to break the habit of poor structure. . . . It is easier to teach an "F" student the basic structures rather than correct the poor structures of a more advanced student.
> - School No. 2, District 4

My chief difficulty is this: undoing the harm that has been done.

- School No. 5, District 9

Differences between PRE Speakers in ESL and English-speaking Peers

In describing how these "advanced" students are different from their English-speaking peers, or from other Puerto Rican students in their class who were not recommended for ESL, only one teacher again expressed a negative judgment by mentioning their "sloppy pronunciation." The others all used more neutral terminology. They discussed "interference from native language," "limited vocabulary," and "noticeable grammar difficulties." Two teachers believed that the ESL students had been recommended because they are "low achievers" and "non-readers" while other Puerto Rican students (who may speak the same way as ESL pupils) are not referred for ESL instruction because they are "functioning well in their regular classroom." One said that "sometimes selection for ESL is arbitrary, reflecting more than student need." Although he did not elaborate, we might expect that this "arbitrary" selection is made on the basis of low classroom achievement. This rather satiric comment also points up the feeling on the part of some ESL teachers that a few students are recommended for ESL for other than linguistic reasons, e.g. a student who is disruptive, unruly and unmanageable in his own class might be sent to the ESL class to provide relief for his teacher. The

correlation between bad behavior and low achievement is usually positive, thus ensuring that child's eligibility for ESL if he is of Puerto Rican background.

Description of Students' Language

Unlike the teachers in Hughes' study (see p. 31 above), these teachers were quite specific when asked to identify language problems of their students. They detailed phonological, morphological and syntactical problems very perceptively for the most part. The only vague comments they made related to vocabulary: some said their students' speech was characterized by "a more basic vocabulary," "lack of extensive vocabulary," and "limited vocabulary," without explicitly citing what words or types of words the students did not know. Only one specific example of vocabulary difficulty was given: the use of break for tear, as in My paper broke.

The teachers' observations of pronunciation and grammatical features in their students' speech are listed below. Those marked with an asterisk (*) are also found in Black English speech (see pp. 21-23 above) and those marked with a "P" are mentioned by Wolfram in his study of PRE (see p. 25 above). The number in parentheses at the end of each entry refers to the number of teachers who listed the feature.

Pronunciation

* 1. "th is pronounced d." This teacher neglected to say anything, however, about the pronunciation of /t/ or /f/ for /θ/, nor did she specify whether this th-d confusion occurs in word-initial, word-final or medial position. (1)

2. "They get confused with v and b." (1)

3. "trouble with ch and sh words" (2)

4. "y in yellow pronounced as a j." The same two teachers who heard the ch-sh confusion heard the j-y problem, too.

5. "vowel sound ee (sheep) said i (ship)" It was the same two teachers again who noticed this lack of discrimination.

6. "confusion between vowel sounds in hat/hot and map/mop" (1)

7. "difficulty in hearing and producing w as in woman, water" (1)

8. One teacher observed a certain problem but described it inaccurately. She said, "They have trouble with initial s as in Spanish, speak." If this teacher knew any Spanish, she would realize this is a difficulty with the s-cluster (st-, sp-, sl-, sk-, etc.) which never occurs in word-initial position in Spanish.

* 9. "/r/ at the end of words may be omitted." (1)

10. Problems of stress and intonation. Three teachers noted "native language intonation," "interference" from "Spanish intonation," and problems with stress, incorrectly identified as intonation: "In relating a story, which would necessitate a certain emphasis to carry the meaning, the intonation [sic] may be off and therefore one may miss the point." Another teacher said, "Noun determiners are stressed instead of the noun." One noticed that "they speak in nasal tones." (5)

Grammar

1. gots/got used in place of has/have. This was almost universally recognized; eight teachers mentioned it.

2. haves for has. My father haves a car. (6)

3. lack of subject-verb agreement. Half the teachers questioned spoke about this. They quoted students as saying You was in school yesterday? Bananas is yellow, There is three mens, My father work, etc. (5)

* 4. deletion of final s from third person singular present tense verbs. This is one reason for the lack of subject-verb agreement: My father work, She go to school, etc. The absence of this s was reported by all the teachers.

* 5. use of ain't for am not, is not, are not. (6)

6. lack of inversion of subject and verb in forming questions. This was reported for sentences with be (Where the girls are? You was here?) as well as for verbs that require an auxiliary (You speak Spanish?) and questions with modals (I can give out the crayons?) (7)

* 7. lack of auxiliaries in forming questions: You speak Spanish? Where he went?

* 8. use of do for does. Carmen do. Occasional use of doos as a hypercorrect form has been reported. (8)

* 9. absence of copula. I sitting. Why she crying? We in the fourth grade. (6)

10. problems with tense marking:

* a. present tense: omission of s from third person (9)

b. past progressive frequently used where simple past is needed (1)

* c. present perfect: omission of auxiliary. We been there; We seen it. (4)

* d. simple past of regular verbs: deletion of -ed endings. (5) One teacher noted a hypercorrect pronunciation of /id/ on /t/ and /d/ verbs as in walkid but did not offer whether this was said in conversation or in oral reading. Evidence from other studies suggests the latter. Another hypercorrection that was listed by two teachers is the addition of /id/ to verbs already in the past tense, as likeded or openeded.

e. simple past of irregular verbs. Often tense is unmarked, as in My mother buy me new shoes yesterP day. More characteristic is the pleonastic tense marking discussed by Wolfram (see p. 25 above) in which both the auxiliary and the main verb are marked for past tense: Did you saw him? Lucy didn't came today. This feature was the one most commonly reported. Only two failed to point it out.

* 11. multiple negation. There wasn't nobody there. (3)

* 12. use of mines. I feel like changing mines. (8)

13. adjective placement. Occasionally after nouns, more frequently when there are two or more adjectives, as in Did you see those nice big apples and juicy? (2)

14. comparative and superlative forms of adjectives. Several teachers cited such forms as more better, worser, more bigger, more big, most tallest, etc. One teacher reported that his students repeat the adjective to show degree, thus, hot hot means very hot or hotter. (3)

15. plural formation.

* a. lack of s ending on regular plurals. Three boy, some banana. (8)

* b. addition of s on irregular plurals. tooths, foots, sheeps. (2)

* c. double plurals. mens, womens, feets. (2)

16. lack of discrimination between in and on (2)

* 17. pronominal apposition. My brother he . . . (4)

As we can see by looking at the number of asterisks at the left, many phonological and grammatical features of Black English occur also in the speech of Puerto Rican students. Of course, some speech features of the Puerto Rican students are not common to Black English, such as adjective placement after the noun, which may be due to interference from Spanish. Further linguistic analysis is needed to identify accurately the complete linguistic system of PRE. This small-scale study may serve as a preliminary identification.

There was a high degree of consensus among the teachers on most items, especially on grammatical items.

Several linguistic features were cited by all, or nearly all, of the respondents. This suggests, too, that the items do not occur in isolation in the speech of any one child, but are common among students in the same school. It seems, then, that there is a great deal of consistency in the speech of these Puerto Rican students yet not one of the teachers perceived it as a patterned linguistic system.

In addition, there are some features which the teachers did not mention but which have been recorded at various times by this writer during classroom observation of PRE speakers.

Some of these additional items are listed below.

Pronunciation

* P 1. pronunciation of /f/ for morpheme-final /θ/, toof for tooth, bafroom for bathroom, birfday for birthday.

* P 2. omission of last sound in word-final consonant clusters, as in I'm finish' for I'm finished; What's lef'? for What's left?

* 3. omission of syllable-final /l/. little, pencil are pronounced with a vowel-like sound at the end.

Grammar

1. use of for to mean in order to. This usage may be due to Spanish interference (para) or ignorance of the English conjunction so. Why do you have to study? For we could get good marks. So would be appropriate here. What's this for? For to wash your hand. Para (in order to) seems to fit here.

2. use of where at as a unit. Where is he at? You know where is it at? This is an observable feature of Black English.

* 3. use of indefinite article *a* before vowels. *a elephant*.

4. subject-verb inversion in claused introduced by wh- question words. *You know where is it at? She didn't see when did they go*.

5. misuse of prepositions *to*, *at*, *for*, *from*. *I'm gonna make one of these to my mother*.

Vocabulary

One teacher mentioned the use of *break* for *tear*. This is a usage that we have recorded on numerous occasions in ESL classes. Another common lexical substitution is *wash my teeth* for *brush my teeth*. The expression *a piece of* is hardly ever used; we hear instead *a paper*, *a chalk*. (*I need a chalk*.)

Although many of the features cited are obviously caused by Spanish interference, such as the lack of discrimination between *in* and *on* or between *wash my teeth* and *brush my teeth*, it should be remembered that the students who uttered them are fluent, often monolingual, speakers of English. Most, if not all, of these children speak English all the time. Spanish plays little part in their present social interactions. Such students are speaking a variety of English which may have historical vestiges of Spanish but which is a self-contained linguistic system. The use of this system does not necessarily indicate that the speaker is bilingual in Spanish and English. A more careful assessment of each student's language usage and competencies will determine that.

One teacher was aware of the problem of variability and frequency of usage within the speech of a given individual. She said, "Someof these errors occur occasionally -- hardly all the time . . . One of the problems [in teaching] is since the errors are made inconsistently, one may fall into the trap of thinking they know something which they don't know." There seems to be a lop-sided emphasis here. It is probably just as easy to "fall into the trap" of thinking the students do not know something which they, in fact, do know. If a student is heard using ain't it by no means assures us that he does not know isn't.

One teacher supported the point about variability of usage although she did not define it as such:

> . . . in the ESL classroom the child will say the correct pattern. . . . but in ordinary conversation the mistake still appears.
>
> - School No. 4, District 7

The word mistake betrays a negative evaluation based on a lack of appreciation of code-switching skills (see p. 45 above).

Another teacher was disappointed by her students' failure to use classroom English in other settings:

> One might drill He has, he has and yet find . . . the student comes out with He gots, he gots or it's mines!
>
> - School No. 7, District 15

These teachers have correctly observed that their students can adapt their language when called upon to do so in class, but they evaluate such variability negatively instead of seeing it as a linguistic skill.

Description of Major Language Problems

In response to the question, "What would you say are the major language problems of this group?" the teachers cited problems that can be classified into two types: contact with non-standard dialects, and poor motivation to change their speech.

> I think the major problem is this: these children imitate and learn what is, at times, sub-standard English. Frequently, they speak with a drawl that is highly reminiscent of the South.
> - School No. 5, District 9

> . . . despite the fact that the students are taught the grammatical form in class, often they pick up bad forms in their environment due to the poor socio-economic areas in which they live.
> - School No. 7, District 15

> . . . the language of the peers (often sub-standard) and the lingo of the street is very noticeable.
> - School No. 6, District 9

Although these teachers perceived the significance of the effect on the child's language of the vernacular, they were not able to use appropriate terminology to define the problem. The use of the expressions sub-standard and bad forms suggest a lack of awareness of the distinction between standard and non-standard varieties of a language or unfamiliarity with linguistic analysis of such phenomena.

By far, the most frequently mentioned "problem" was in the area of motivational drive and perceived need. The "F" students were seen as being much more highly motivated than these PRE speakers. This lack of motivation poses a great challenge to teachers.

First, the students have to be taught how to perceive

their own speech as different from the model presented by the teacher. Then they must be motivated to want to adopt that model. "I talk English good" is a retort frequently heard in the ESL class. The following exchange, with variations, has been observed on more than a few occasions in various classrooms:

Teacher: Whose is this?
Student: Mines.
Teacher: It's mine.
Student: That's what I said.

Another common misunderstanding of the relationship between form and meaning in the ESL class (see p. 51 above) illustrates the child's inability to perceive when the teacher is correcting the form of his communication and what he needs to correct. The following dialogue, during a discussion of a television program the night before, is an example:

Teacher: What was the name of the program?
Student A: I didn't saw it.
Teacher: I didn't see it.
Student B: You didn't?

Because these students have achieved what Virginia French Allen calls "passive bidialectalism"[1] they can understand SE perfectly. Yet they may not be able to control a specific feature on the oral level. They ". . . may require proof of the gap between receptive and productive skills."[2]

---

[1]V. F. Allen, "A Second Dialect is not a Foreign Language," p. 190.

[2]Ibid., p. 192.

> These children think they know English and therefore resent any correction. They are not very anxious to change and do not listen quite so carefully as those who are just beginning.
>
> - School No. 6, District 9

> Because these students feel that they are sufficiently fluent in English, it is difficult to motivate them. Since they make themselves understood and can comprehend what is going on in school, they feel ESL is not vital.
>
> - School No. 2, District 4

> Unlike . . . "F" students, these youngsters do not take easily to normal drills, pattern practice, etc. used in ESL teaching; drills must be made interesting - fun as well as challenging (latter especially) so they can see the need for them and interest is sustained. . . . they need to be strongly motivated . . . they are satisfied that their level of fluency is satisfactory.
>
> - School No. 1, District 1

One teacher's insights will be quoted at length since they summarize many of the sociolinguistic principles central to an understanding of standard dialect acquisition.

> They rarely identify their own linguistic errors. They don't seem to recognize them as errors and incorporate them into their normal everyday speech patterns . . . everyone understands what is being said in spite of the errors. . . . they have little need to become totally proficient in L_2. There seems to be little if any motivation to learn [English] since all of their basic human needs are being met in a developing bilingual society. I honestly feel the language "problems" aren't only structural or phonemic in this case. They do seem to be based on some sort of psychological relationship with the second language.
>
> - School No. 3, District 6

This teacher also said he thought students were saying, "I'm not ready to commit myself to acquiring proficiency" because of the personal conflict it would cause.

Description of Problems in Teaching

In response to the question, "What are the difficulties you encounter in teaching these students English?" the teacher in School No. 3 in Manhattan said:

> I want to inform them that they "need" to know English to function successfully. They are obviously oblivious to this need. (Or is it that they don't understand the American notion of success?!?)

These comments reveal an understanding of the effects of social and psychological variables on motivation and learning. Although several teachers recognized their students' lack of motivation, only one attributed this lack to societal factors. The studies by Richards (see p. 59 above) support the view of the last teacher and of this writer that Puerto Rican students in New York, because of the type of bilingual communities in which they live, do <u>not</u> have a strong need to learn standard English, do <u>not</u> value it positively and therefore have a correspondingly low desire to learn it.

Most of the other teachers repeated what they had offered as students' language problems (contact with non-standard vernacular and lack of perceived need) for this question on teaching problems.

Summary

On the whole, the teachers who responded to this questionnaire provide corroboration for the hypothesis being tested: that trained and licensed ESL teachers are more likely than regular classroom teachers to perceive their students' language problems correctly and to describe them accurately. A corresponding hypothesis which should also be tested is that such linguistic abilities contribute to more effective teaching.

However, even these teachers had several misconceptions of a rather serious nature. There was evidence of ignorance and misinformation in some areas. One teacher who claimed to speak Spanish demonstrated her ignorance of Puerto Rican Spanish by saying:

> They do speak Spanish at home but grammatically, the structure is very poor in their native tongue. They omit final s, e.g. lo pantalone.

The deletion of final s and the substitution of an aspirated /h/ is a systematic feature of Puerto Rican Spanish.

Other teachers, by their reliance on descriptors such as sub-standard, bad and sloppy, were decidedly negative in their judgment of students' speech. By their omission of more neutral and scientific terms as non-standard, language variety or Puerto Rican English, they evidenced their lack of knowledge of the systematic nature of their students' language.

Not one teacher was able to characterize students' code-switching behaviors as a communication skill.

On the other hand, they were cognizant of the essential factor in the students' failure to acquire Standard English: the influence of the non-standard vernacular which is spoken in the community.

The linguistic data obtained from the list of phonological and grammatical features in students' speech and the information obtained indirectly on teachers' attitudes and knowledge will be put to use in planning future training sessions for these and for forty-five other ESL teachers whom this writer supervises.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

The recognition that considerable numbers of Puerto Rican children are enrolled in ESL programs, although these children may, in fact, speak English (a non-standard variety), calls for an analysis of assessment policies and for more information about these students and their language, as well as about the issues involved in teaching them Standard English.

An examination of the assessment and placement policies that were employed in enrolling these students in ESL classes has been specifically excluded from consideration due to constraints imposed by the scope of this paper. It is an area of study, however, which should not be neglected.

What we have attempted to do, simply, is, given the fact of such enrollment, to define as clearly as possible who these students are, what their English skills are and how ESL teachers may most effectively instruct them.

For students who speak a non-standard variety of English, such as Puerto Rican English, the ESL class becomes a class in Standard English as a Second Dialect. Unfortunately, not all ESL teachers of PRE speakers are aware of this necessary and crucial distinction or of the demands imposed on them by the different language needs of these students. As evidenced by their responses to the questionnaire discussed in Chapter III,

these teachers know little about the systematic nature of PRE and are sometimes confused as to how to deal with students who are fluent and can communicate easily in English. The teachers' lack of information may be due to the conspicuous absence of linguistic studies of PRE and to the highly technical nature of the few studies which have been done, namely those by Labov, Fishman and Wolfram. Except for Labov's work, which deals almost exclusively with Black English, however, none of these studies attempts to provide practical and useful data to educators. The need for data which will be helpful in planning for the education of Puerto Rican students is critical.

The responses of the ESL teachers did demonstrate their relative neutrality concerning non-standard dialects, at least in comparison with the classroom teachers surveyed by Hughes. They expressed fewer negative judgments than Hughes' teachers.

The teachers listed the phonological and syntactical features which they have isolated in their students' speech by direct classroom observation. Some of these are attributable to Spanish interference, some to assimilation of Black English and other non-standard dialects and still others are unique to PRE, i.e. not traceable to either source.

There was significant agreement among all the teachers on the specific features they hear in their students' speech. A few features were cited unanimously. All over New York City, in schools located in low-income, predominantly Black and

Puerto Rican communities, Puerto Rican students are using the same type of English. The combined responses reveal a great deal of consistency despite geographic diversity. The individual teachers did not recognize this phenomenon; they did not notice any degree of consistency in the patterns of their own students. Yet when viewed all together, the regularity and universality of the patterns is easily observed.

These ESL teachers were also more capable of giving accurate linguistic descriptions of phonology and syntax than the teachers studied by Hughes.

The provocative results of this small-scale study are by no means conclusive. They do suggest, however, that while ESL teachers do not have sophisticated theoretical or pedagogical knowledge about non-standard dialects or about teaching English as a Second Dialect, they are nevertheless potentially better prepared for such teaching than regular teachers without any background in the field of linguistics.

Second-dialect teaching has been shown to be different from second-language teaching; the attitudes of learners and teachers in both situations have been compared, as well as the different teaching methods needed.

Societal influences on an individual's acquisition of a standard dialect have been argued to be at least as important as individual motivation and skills in learning. The economic and social structure of the mainstream society

may actually inhibit an individual's possibilities for interaction with Standard English speakers and hence the need and desire to learn it will also be inhibited. Conflicting personal goals are also a barrier to acquisition of SE.

The appropriateness of both standard and non-standard varieties in different social contexts has been stressed. It is essential for teachers to aim at adding SE to their students' repertoire rather than eradicating PRE.

It is hoped that this study may be useful to teachers of Puerto Rican students in New York and in other large cities where similar conditions exist for the Puerto Rican community. If it has clarified the sometimes complex and often emotional issues surrounding standard and non-standard dialects, it will have been successful.

APPENDIX 1

QUESTIONNAIRE TO TEACHERS OF ESL

School District _____ Borough _____

1. Number of Puerto Rican students enrolled in ESL in grades one through eight _____

2. Of these, how many are "advanced" ESL students, i.e. verbally fluent, lifelong residents of New York City, maybe English dominant or even English monolingual, but still in need of English instruction? _____

Please answer the following questions based on your observations of the students identified in number 2 above:

3. How are these students different from newly-arrived, Spanish-speaking ESL students ("F" students)? You may discuss linguistic, psychological, social differences, etc.

4. How are these students different from their English-speaking peers, students in their regular class who have <u>not</u> been recommended for ESL?

5. What would you say are the major language problems of this group? Please be as specific as possible.

QUESTIONNAIRE (Continued)

6. How would you characterize the English speech of these students? You may cite phonological, lexical, morphological and syntactical characteristics, as well as intonation, rate, fluency, etc.

7. What are the difficulties you encounter in teaching these students English?

Thank you for your cooperation.

APPENDIX 2

PERSONAL DATA SHEET

Male _____ Female _____

Age: 20 - 25 _____
25 - 35 _____
35 - 45 _____
45 - 55 _____
55 - 65 _____

Do you speak any language other than English? Yes ____ No _____

If so, which language(s)? _____

How many years have you been teaching ESL?
3 or less _____
3 - 5 _____
5 - 10 _____
10 or more _____

Check the courses you have taken:
Descriptive Linguistics _____
Sociology of Language _____
Psycholinguistics _____
Phonetics _____
Cultural Anthropology _____
Methods of Teaching ESL _____

Other courses you have found useful _____

APPENDIX 3

ORAL LANGUAGE ABILITY RATING SCALE[1]

A - Speaks English, for his age level, like a native, with no foreign accent or hesitancy due to interference of a foreign language.

B - Speaks English with a foreign accent, but otherwise approximates the fluency of a native speaker of like age level. Does not hesitate because he must search for English words and language forms.

C - Can speak English well enough for most situations met by typical native pupils of like age, but still must make a conscious effort to avoid the language forms of some foreign language. Depends, in part, upon translation of words and expressions from the foreign language into English, and therefore, speaks hesitantly upon occasion.

D - Speaks English in more than a few stereotyped situations, but speaks it haltingly at all times.

E - Speaks English only in those stereotyped situations for which he has learned a few useful words and expressions.

F - Speaks no English.

---

[1]Board of Education of the City of New York, Puerto Rican Study Report: Oral Language Ability Rating Scale (New York: The Board of Education, 1958), p. 169.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, Harold B. and Campbell, Russell N., eds. Teaching English as a Second Language. 2d ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc. 1972.

Allen, Virginia French. "A Second Dialect is not a Foreign Language." In 20th Annual Round Table: Linguistics and the Teaching of Standard English to Speakers of Other Languages or Dialects, pp. 189-202. Edited by James E. Alatis. Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics, no. 22. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1969.

Andersson, Theodore and Boyer, Mildred. Bilingual Schooling in the United States. 2 vols. Auxtin, Texas: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, 1970.

Baratz, Joan C. "Teaching Reading in an Urban Negro School System." In Teaching Black Children to Read, pp. 92-116. Edited by Joan C. Baratz and Roger W. Shuy. Urban Language Series, no. 4. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969.

_____. "Educational Considerations for Teaching Standard English to Negro Children." In Teaching Standard English in the Inner City, pp. 20-40. Edited by Ralph W. Fasold and Roger W. Shuy. Urban Language Series, no. 6. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1970.

Baratz, Joan C. and Roger W. Shuy, eds. Teaching Black Children to Read. Urban Language Series, no. 4. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969.

Board of Education of the City of New York. Nonstandard Dialect. Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1968.

Cazden, Courtney B.; John, Vera P.; and Hymes, Dell, eds. Functions of Language in the Classroom. New York: Teachers College Press, 1972.

Center for Applied Linguistics. "Dialect as a Social Determinant." Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1974. (Mimeographed.)

_____. "Linguistic Issues in Bilingual Education." Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1974. (Mimeographed.)

Chiu, Rosaline K. "Measuring Register Characteristics: A Prerequisite for Preparing Advanced TESOL Programs." TESOL Quarterly 6 (June, 1972): 129-141.

Cooper, Robert L. "Psychologically Oriented Studies." In Fishman, Joshua A.; Cooper, Robert L.; Ma, Roxana et al., Bilingualism in the Barrio, pp. 273-344. 2d ed. rev. Language Science Monographs, no. 7. Bloomington: Indiana University, 1975.

Fasold, Ralph W. and Shuy, Roger W., eds. Teaching Standard English in the Inner City. Urban Language Series, no. 6. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1970.

Fasold, Ralph W. and Wolfram, Walt. "Some Linguistic Features of Negro Dialect." In Teaching Standard English in the Inner City, pp. 41-86. Edited by Ralph W. Fasold and Roger W. Shuy. Urban Language Series, no. 6. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1970.

Fishman, Joshua A.; Cooper, Robert L.; Ma, Roxana, et al. Bilingualism in the Barrio. Language Science Monographs, no. 7. 2d ed. rev. Bloomington: Indiana University, 1975.

Fraser, Bruce. Non-Standard English. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 045 960, 1970.

Gardner, R.C.; Smythe, P.C.; Clement, R.; and Gliksman, L. "Second Language Learning: A Social Psychological Perspective." Canadian Modern Language Review 32 (February, 1976): 198-213.

Goodman, Kenneth S. "Dialect Barriers to Reading Comprehension." In Teaching Black Children to Read, pp. 14-28. Edited by Joan C. Baratz and Roger W. Shuy. Urban Language Series, no. 4. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969.

Gumperz, John J. and Hernandez-Chavez, Eduardo. "Bilingualism, Bidialectalism, and Classroom Interaction." In Functions of Language in the Classroom, pp. 84-108. Edited by Courtney B. Cazden, Vera P. John, and Dell Hymes. New York: Teachers College Press, 1972.

Haugen, Einar. "Bilingualism and Bidialectalism." In Social Dialects and Language Learning, pp. 124-126. Edited by Roger W. Shuy. Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1964.

Hoffman, Gerard. "Puerto Ricans in New York: A Language-Related Ethnographic Summary." In Fishman, Joshua A.; Cooper, Robert L.; Ma, Roxana et al., Bilingualism in the Barrio, pp. 13-42. 2d ed. rev. Language Science Monographs, no. 7. Bloomington: Indiana University, 1975.

Labov, William. The Social Stratification of English in New York City. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1966.

_____. "Some Sources of Reading Problems for Negro Speakers of Nonstandard English." In Teaching Black Children to Read, pp. 29-67. Edited by Joan C. Baratz and Roger W. Shuy. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969.

_____. "Stages in the Acquisition of Standard English." In Social Dialects and Language Learning, pp. 77-103. Edited by Roger W. Shuy. Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1964.

_____. The Study of Non-Standard English. Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1970.

Labov, William; Cohen, Paul; Robins, Clarence; and Lewis, John. A Study of the Non-Standard English of Negro and Puerto Rican Speakers in New York City. 2 vols. Final Report, Cooperative Research Project No. 3288, Office of Education. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 028 423, 1968.

Lado, Robert. Linguistics Across Cultures. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1957.

Ma, Roxana and Herasimchuk, Eleanor. "The Linguistic Dimensions of a Bilingual Neighborhood." In Fishman, Joshua A.; Cooper, Robert L.; Ma, Roxana et al., Bilingualism in the Barrio, pp. 347-464. Language Science Monographs, no. 7. Bloomington: Indiana University, 1975.

Mackey, William F. "A Typology of Bilingual Education." In Teaching English as a Second Language, pp. 414-423. 2d ed. Edited by Harold B. Allen and Russell N. Campbell. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1972.

Macnamara, John. "Attitudes and learning a second language." In Language Attitudes: Current Trends and Prospects, pp. 36-40. Edited by Roger W. Shuy and Ralph W. Fasold. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1973.

Marckwardt, Albert H. "Review of the Conference." In Social Dialects and Language Learning, pp. 151-157. Edited by Roger W. Shuy. Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1964.

McDavid, Raven I., Jr. "Dialectology and the Teaching of Reading." In Teaching Black Children to Read, pp. 1-13. Edited by Joan C. Baratz and Roger W. Shuy. Urban Language Series, no. 6. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969.

Paulston, Christina Bratt. "Theoretical Perspectives of Bilingual Education." Paper presented at Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1978, Washington, D.C., 16 March 1978.

Richards, Jack C. "Social Factors, Interlanguage and Language Learning." Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 066 966, 1973.

_____. "Some Social Aspects of Language Learning." TESOL Quarterly 6 (September, 1972): 243-254.

Sampson, Gloria Paulik. "A Real Challenge to ESL Methodogy." TESOL Quarterly 11 (September, 1977): 241-255.

Schmidt, Richard W. and Carol F. McCreary. "Standard and Super-Standard English." TESOL Quarterly 11 (December, 1977): 415-429.

Shuy, Roger W. "A Linguistic Background for Developing Beginning Reading Materials for Black Children." In Teaching Black Children to Read, pp. 117-137. Edited by Joan C. Baratz and Roger W. Shuy. Urban Language Series, no. 4. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969.

_____. "Teacher Training and Urban Language Problems." In Teaching Standard English in the Inner City, pp. 120-141. Edited by Ralph W. Fasold and Roger W. Shuy. Urban Language Series, no. 6. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1970.

_____, ed. Social Dialects and Language Learning. Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1964.

Shuy, Roger W. and Rasold, Ralph W., eds. Language Attitudes: Current Trends and Prospects. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1973.

Shuy, Roger W. and Rasold, Ralph W. "Contemporary Emphases in Sociolinguistics." In Sociolinguistics in Cross-Cultural Analysis, pp. 1-14. Edited by David M. Smith and Roger W. Shuy Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1972.

Smith, David M. and Shuy, Roger W., eds. Sociolinguistics in Cross-Cultural Analysis. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1972.

Stewart, William A. "Urban Negro Speech: Sociolinguistic Factors Affecting English Teaching." In Social Dialects and Language Learning, pp. 10-18. Edited by Roger W. Shuy. Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1964.

_____. "On the Use of Negro Dialect in the Teaching of Reading." In Teaching Black Children to Read, pp. 156-219. Edited by Joan C. Baratz and Roger W. Shuy. Urban Language Series, no. 4. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969.

_____. "Foreign Language Teaching Methods in Quasi-Foreign Language Situations." In Teaching Standard English in the Inner City, pp. 1-19. Edited by Ralph W. Fasold and Roger W. Shuy. Urban Language Series, no. 6. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1970.

Willis, Robert M. "Training Bilingual Teachers." Address given at International Linguistic Association 23rd Annual Conference, New York, 10 March 1978.

Wolfram, Walt. "Overlapping Influence and Linguistic Assimilation in Second Generation Puerto Rican English." In Sociolinguistics in Cross-Cultural Analysis, pp. 15-40. Edited by David M. Smith and Roger W. Shuy. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1972.

_____. "Objective and Subjective Parameters of Language Assimilation Among Second-Generation Puerto Ricans in East Harlem." In Language Attitudes: Current Trends and Prospects, pp. 148-173. Edited by Roger W. Shuy and Ralph W. Fasold. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1973.

_____. Sociolinguistic Aspects of Assimilation: Puerto Rican English in New York City. Urban Language Series, no. 9. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1974.